Women’s Participation and Gender

This factsheet is designed to provide a brief “snapshot” insight to EU officials engaged in, advising, planning or implementing mediation and dialogue activities either in a cross-cutting thematic fashion or in relation to specific geographic contexts. As women’s representation and gender are fundamental issues and commitments of the EU and determine the quality and sustainability of processes, they are relevant to all EU officials engaged in mediation and dialogue, and not just those with a particular focus on women’s representation or gender.

These factsheets are “work in progress” and feedback is welcome. More information and support on the issues presented are available from the Mediation Support Team of the K2 Division of Conflict Prevention, Peace Building and Mediation Instruments of the EEAS at K2@eeas.europa.eu
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01 Background and Scope

Despite a number of commitments EU and the UN (United Nations Security Council resolutions, 1325, 1889), women remain systematically and very significantly under-represented in formal and semi-formal mediation, negotiation and dialogue processes. In addition a gender perspective is usually ignored in the process and outcomes of peace agreements with far-reaching consequences. This factsheet will seek to address both 1) the role and inclusion of women as mediators and participants in processes of dialogue; and 2) the appropriate inclusion of gender perspectives in the outcomes of agreements from mediation and dialogue processes (such as peace agreements). The EU recognises that “women’s under-representation in mediation processes and peace negotiations as well as the lack of gender expertise in mediation teams seriously limits the extent to which women’s experience of conflict, and consequent needs for justice and recovery, are addressed within these processes.”

This factsheet will focus specifically on issues around mediation and dialogue rather than the important issues associated with women, gender and peace building more widely such as early warning of the risk of sexual violence in war, yet obviously there are strong linkages.

The 2009 EU Concept on mediation and dialogue notes the role of the EU as a mediator, but also that the EU can play a role promoting, leveraging, supporting, and funding mediation and dialogue activities, all of which are relevant to women’s participation and gender. The 2009 Concept notes that women’s under-representation in mediation processes and peace negotiations, as well as the lack of gender expertise among mediation teams, has serious consequences.

1. Women’s participation. There are persistently low levels of women involved in mediation and dialogue, particularly at the Track 1 (highest) level. This is the number of women who are members of negotiating parties or signatories, but also mediators, special envoys or representatives, or high-level advisors to mediated agreements. The figures suggest that the under-representation of women at the negotiation table is at a more marked level than historic women’s under-representation in other public decision-making roles. This is an issue of participation and is relevant not only to third parties but also to the European Union itself in terms of the number and percentage of women the EU has in these roles. The key way to address this would be first to increase women’s participation by the EU itself through prioritising women’s appointment to key roles that are likely to be involved in EU mediation and dialogue. Where third parties are concerned the EU as the 2009 concept notes can also promote, leverage, support and fund women’s participation in mediation and dialogue in general or in relation to processes taking place in specific geographic contexts. The EU already has a specific commitment to support women’s participation in peace processes through both diplomacy and financial support.

Box 1: Key Messages for EU Officials

1. The chance of lasting peace increases if not only the warring parties but also representatives from different groups in civil society, including women, sit at the negotiation table.

2. A gender dimension (for example addressing gender-based violence, women in Demobilisation, Disarmament and Reintegration processes, women in post-conflict governance structures) is systematically lacking or of poor quality in agreements resulting from processes of mediation and dialogue – this weakens them, their relevance, and their sustainability.

3. The international community and the EU specifically have commitments to, and can practically undertake, specific measures to promote, leverage, support or fund women’s participation and/or the addressing of gender issues in mediation and dialogue processes.

4. The message the EU itself sends in terms of women appointed by EU institutions and member-state bodies is important for its own credibility in promoting women’s participation more widely. While EU indicators and commitment exist, follow-through and monitoring are continually necessary and additional complementary measures may have to be taken.

5. The EU has to appreciate, discuss and act on not only the perceived obstacles to the inclusion of women and gender in sensitive on-going processes of mediation and dialogue, but also the risks of exclusion.
2. The “substance” and outcomes of mediation and dialogue processes consistently do not address gender. This means they do not ensure that gender is a key consideration of the mediation and dialogue process and the substance of discussions, agreements, their implementation and the monitoring of them. While it is important to note that gender and women are not synonymous, a study from the University of Ulster (2010), based on a screening of 585 peace agreements signed between 1990 and 2010, concluded that only 16 per cent of peace agreements contain references to women. Even when references to women are included, they tend to be rather weak in qualitative terms. Priorly gender-specific provisions in peace accords have been noted as women’s guaranteed physical security and human rights. Yet these will also be affected by different contexts and thus cannot be prejudged. From this arises the need to analyse the substantive gender-related issues in each individual context as part of a conflict analysis, as well as to ensure the specific provision of gender expertise and reliance on input and expertise from local women’s groups and civil society.

Women’s participation is a necessity throughout any process of mediation and dialogue at any level - from Track 1 (highest level), through Track 2 (mid-level) to Track 3 (grassroots). It should be noted that formal peace agreements are usually concluded without women’s participation and if they are not gender-sensitive, can bring further insecurity and poverty for women. Gender considerations are relevant throughout any process of mediation and dialogue. 

### Table 1: EU various potential roles in relation to mediation and dialogue and women’s participation and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The EU in mediation and dialogue</th>
<th>Examples of potential EU roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. European Union as a mediator or facilitator to dialogue:</td>
<td>The European Union, like most international organisations, has historically a bad record in the participation of women at the highest level of mediation and dialogue processes and has recognised the need to monitor this. However, a woman in HRVP Ashton does lead the EU’s engagement with Iran and facilitates the dialogue between Kosovo and Serbia, as well as being involved in engagement with Myanmar. The EEAS Deputy Secretary General, Helga Schmid, is intensively engaged in political dialogue processes as a core function. More recently there has been the appointment of Dame Rosalind Marsden as EU Special Representative for Sudan and South Sudan, the first woman to be an EUSR, recently having been joined by Patricia Flor for Central Asia. The current (2012) Director for Conflict and Security in the EEAS is also a woman. In the Philippines both EU members of the International Monitoring Team for Mindanao were women, a fact appreciated by local parties. However the recognition remains that the EU still needs to do significantly more in its appointments at this level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promoting mediation and dialogue (by drawing on its own experience):</td>
<td>Women involved in the Northern Ireland peace process have shared their expertise and experience beyond the EU, at times with the support of the EU. Yet this remains a relatively under-utilised resource. The EU has consistently promoted the role of women in mediation through statements at UNGA. The EU itself has an informal Task force on 1325 (Women, Peace and Security) whose role is to pool and draw on experience among EU institutions, member-states and key partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leveraging mediation and dialogue:</td>
<td>Examples could include refusing to meet or fund parties to mediation and dialogue processes unless women are included or gender issues are addressed. There is no evidence as yet that the EU has done this, although it has been suggested as a course of action by some civil society groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supporting mediation and dialogue:</td>
<td>The EU has supported training and capacity building for African regional organisations in gender, women’s and mediation issues. It partially funded the AU mediation whereby a senior-level woman, Graça Machel, was one of the three mediators along with Kofi Annan for the Kenyan crisis in 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Funding mediation and dialogue:</td>
<td>The EU is active on the issue of women, peace and security in more than 70 countries. Its support amounts to about EUR 200 million a year for the development and the implementation of national action plans, funding for non-governmental organisations, and training for governmental agencies. The EIDHR, IF and African Peace Facility have been used in the past (as well as currently) to fund specific initiatives related to women’s participation and gender issues, often with the involvement of the UN or civil society. EU member-states have also funded such activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
02 Key issues and dilemmas

Moving from commitments to action on women’s participation – overcoming barriers and inertia.

There are several obstacles that have to be overcome before progress can be made. These include the pervasiveness of violence against women (which limits participation or desire for participation), the frequent use of slander against women politicians as a weapon to silence them, and the barriers that are sometimes associated with expectations and roles within their own families and communities that limit their ability to engage in drawn-out political processes. Barriers also come from persistent political exclusion. Yet with appropriate support, none of these factors are insurmountable or an excuse for inaction. The accusation that women are less qualified has been debunked in the sense that there is no evidence to indicate that men engaging in mediation and negotiation are more qualified. This does not however mean that additional capacity building, training, support to networking and exposure to peer experience is not valuable for women’s participation in mediation and dialogue. The key issue therefore is backing up commitments with action and also getting beyond tokenism when it comes to mediation and dialogue and women’s participation. See box 4 for some example of EU action.

It is women’s participation at the highest level where the biggest gaps and challenges exist.

This despite the fact that women may be more represented in process of dialogue at other levels such as grassroots or may have had an important role in the events or processes that led up to the dialogue and mediation process reaching the Track 1 level (such as the Arab Spring and in Egypt – see box 6).

Box 5: Some EU commitments on women’s participation

The EU’s Working Party of Human Rights of the Council issues a two-yearly report on EU indicators for the Comprehensive Approach to the implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 & 1820. While all indicators are relevant, of particular interest are:

- Number and percentage of women mediators and negotiators and women’s civil society groups in formal or informal peace negotiations supported by the EU (Indicator 8);
- EU activities in support of women’s participation in peace negotiations (Indicator 9);
- Proportion of women and men amongst heads of diplomatic missions, staff participating in UN peacekeeping operations and CSDP missions at all levels, including military and police staff (Indicator 10);
- Number of women in EU delegations (Indicator 11).

In addition the EU has used the following specific text in the recruitment of EUSR teams from Member-States:

“The EU strives for improved gender balance in CFSP operations in conformity with UNSCR 1325. The General Secretariat encourages Member States to consider to taking this into account when presenting candidates.”

In addition within the EEAS more generally there is a specific commitment to achieving greater gender parity.

Box 3: Lack of Women’s Participation and Representation

A review of a sample of 21 major peace processes since 1992 shows that women represent a strikingly low number of participants: Only 2.4% of signatories to this sample of peace agreements were women; No women have been appointed Chief or Lead peace mediators in UN-sponsored peace talks, although in some talks sponsored by the AU or other institutions women have joined a team of mediators; Women’s participation in negotiating delegations averaged 5.9% of the 10 cases for which such information was available; From August 2008 to March 2012, women were signatories in only two of the 61 peace agreements that have been concluded; In addition - of the 10 EU Special Representatives in conflict areas in 2012 only two are women; Only 18 per cent of EU member-state Heads of Missions (Ambassadors) - those senior officials most likely to be engaged in mediation and dialogue – are women. The number of women’s representation in most of the peace negotiations supported by the EU is unknown.

Box 4: EU supporting women’s participation – some recent examples

An EU report assessing indicators for women’s participation noted that five EU Member States reported to have financially supported women’s organisations in order to empower them to contribute to informal or formal peace talks. EU Member States supported local women’s organisations in the DRC, Uganda and Sudan. They also channelled support to INGOs to do the same and EU delegations reported relevant funding to civil society organisations in Burma/Myanmar, Nepal, Somalia and Papua New Guinea. As well as financial support non-financial support was also given in terms of the Netherlands having given political support to women in elections and referenda in Sudan and having lobbied for the inclusion of women to take place in the Nairobi Dialogue on Eastern DRC. As regards the Middle East, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Catherine Ashton highlighted the need for having more women involved in peace negotiations on a visit to the region in 2010.
Also by reference to global commitments (UNSCR 1325/1889), earmarking or conditioning financial support, and where possible introducing or backing the introduction of gender quotas are all things that the EU can promote. It can also engage in supporting Track 2 or Track 3 measures that link to Track 1, which is certainly valuable if there is an absence of women’s representation, or a critical mass at the highest level of supporting parallel structures that seek to feed into and influence “Track 1” processes from Track 2 or Track 3 grassroots.

There is evidence that this type of arrangement is emerging more frequently than in the past. Indeed it is at the grassroots and Track 2 level where awareness and expertise may be the strongest as regards women and gender issues. The principle here is that, in the absence of an entry point to link Track 1 level, the EU should seek at other levels to support complementary activities that address women’s participation and gender issues. Yet it should also appreciate the limits of such action and continue to seek to impact the highest level. In case women’s direct participation in the negotiating room is not possible, supporting structures which allow women’s participation/views to be shared with the negotiating parties is useful (for example: convening ‘women’s tables’, undertaking civil society consultations, asking women’s groups for feedback on technical issues relevant to the peace process, etc.).12 In many conflicts women have set up their own peace tables (this is currently the case in Mindanao, Philippines) or developed memoranda/agendas/recommendations outlining their peace process priorities (as in Burundi, the Solomon Islands, Uganda and the December 2011 Libya One Voice conference).13 Yet some women’s rights activists are strongly against this on the basis of experience where this leads to marginalization.

In Uganda there have been various attempts in the past and currently to ensure women’s voices are heard through parallel processes (see box 8). Yet the EU itself acknowledged in the Djibouti Peace Agreement that while women’s civil society organisations were present, they were too outnumbered to have a real impact on the outcomes.14 However, if complementary initiatives can be identified and sensitively supported financially, diplomatically or politically, then they should be by the EU, yet at the same time pressure should be maintained to ensure the participation of women at Track 1 and that there is a “critical mass” of women participating.

**The EU itself is not always practicing what it preaches with regards to women’s participation.**

The risk is that the EU through its own action does not seem to be serious about the issue, making it more difficult for issues of women’s participation or the promotion of gender sensitivity to be addressed by other players. Obviously the converse is also true; where the EU is “leading by example” it gives it more leverage in supporting this agenda with third-party mediators and those involved in dialogue. While many aspects of third-party processes of mediation and dialogue are outside the EU’s scope of influence, this is one aspect that the EU has the capacity to influence as it refers to its own contact. The EU already notes this in some of its own recruitments but some would contend that without real quotas there will be limited progress (see box 5).

---

**Box 6: Women, gender and exclusion – Egypt**

“The men were keen for me to be here when we were demanding Mubarak should go, but now that he is gone, they want me to go home,” noted a [woman Tahrir square demonstrator]. In the case of Egypt this is a telling example. There is no language on gender equality or women’s rights in the new Egyptian provisional constitution. Only six women have been elected to the Parliament. Women crowded Tahrir square but despite their contribution, they are again facing exclusion from the political processes (women ended up with 2% of the seats). Helga Schmid – EEAS Deputy Secretary General) Conference on women and conflict resolution, European Parliament 11 October 2011

**Box 7: Expertise in Darfur**

UNIFEM (Now part of UNWOMEN) seconded a gender expert to the mediation team for the Abuja peace talks for Darfur in 2006. The gender expert helped cement a common gender platform involving women delegates that managed to become incorporated into the Darfur Peace Agreement’s gender-responsive provisions on wealth sharing and land rights, physical security, affirmative action, and women’s participation in disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) programmes.

**Box 8: Uganda parallel processes**

In 2008, despite the presence of women in the negotiation teams for both the Government of Uganda and the LRA, the umbrella civil society organisation the Uganda Women’s Coalition for Peace strongly felt that the some of the initial Agreements did not fully reflect the critical perspectives of women. With further assistance from UNIFEM (supported by EU member-states amongst others), some members of the Uganda Women’s Coalition for Peace then travelled to the Peace Talks in Juba in a bid to acquire observer status and input into the process. While they were not able to obtain an official role in the talks, they did attempt to contribute to the negotiation positions based on their developed proposals. Source: ECDPM.
Addressing gender issues in mediation and dialogue processes requires knowledge and expertise.

As noted women are mostly excluded from formal peace process and it is also incorrect to assume that the inclusion of a few women as part of a process of mediation and dialogue will automatically prioritise or even address gender issues (nor should women participation be focused on women’s issues alone). Yet gender as a “lens” through which to look at issues arising in mediation and dialogue has at times proven hard to grasp and understand by those not exposed to expertise or women’s representatives. There is a need to demystify “gender”, as it often comes down to very functional issues; such as land rights, DDR and Security Sector Reform (SSR) processes, employment, dealing with sexual and gender based violence and the involvement of women in post-conflict governance structures. There are examples of gender having been taken into account in relation to security and protection, political participation and economic empowerment, reconstruction, and socio-economic recovery in negotiated agreements, yet this is the exception rather than the rule. As regards recurring issues such as gender-based violence, specific guidance for mediators has been produced by the UN on how to go about addressing these issues. This guidance notes that addressing conflict-related sexual violence can be seen as part of a continuum: from facilitating security, to dealing with the past, to breaking the cycle of impunity and ensuring reconciliation and rehabilitation, therefore requiring specific considerations during open hostilities and the beginning of mediation, through to drafting and negotiating a ceasefire and peace agreements and ultimately to specific provisions for security and justice. In the absence of a critical mass of women or women’s groups in parallel processes influencing the process, the provision of “expertise” on gender in terms of advice to key officials or an overall “peace process” has some track record in yielding results, and should be considered a key response mechanism for the EU.

Accessing gender expertise at the right time in the right way

The provision of specific gender expertise has become more common for those engaged in mediation and dialogue processes, with a resultant impact on the content and quality of agreements. Yet it is not currently the norm to provide this expertise. It should be noted that local women’s groups and gender specialists will have more knowledge and legitimacy than internationals or even those from the region and it is support to this type of expertise which should be prioritised. For the EU itself gender advisors are a useful addition to the toolbox, but in the past gender advisors have rather been used to support CSDP missions and have often been double- or even triple-hatted, limiting their effectiveness. Gender focal points in EU Delegations is another resource yet it does not automatically follow that these focal points will have the necessary expertise to support the inclusion of gender in mediation and dialogue. Thinking about specific and appropriately qualified gender advisors early on in any setup of an EUSR office, or EU Delegation engaged in mediation and dialogue or regional/geo desk is thus necessary. If such an appointment is not possible, there are other ways for the EU to access expertise on gender including through the EU-supported Mediation Support Unit of the United Nations or its own EU informal Task Force of Women, Peace and Security as well as a number of specialised INGOs (see box 9). Yet the main message is to meet and listen to women locally and to source gender expertise locally.

Box 9 EU supported expertise

The EU has, and has funded, some of the most prominent organisations working on women’s participation and gender and these have significant expertise to draw on. It has also developed its own expertise. While expertise and insight on these issues is best sourced locally for reasons of ownership and legitimacy, there is a rich amount of operational guidance, support, insight and on-the-ground experience into which EU officials can tap. While any list risks significant omissions, the EU has a specific informal Women, Peace and Security Task Force comprising officials from EU institutions and EU member-states. The umbrella civil society organisation the European Peace-building Liaison Office includes a Gender, Peace and Security Working Group (GPS-WG), and many EPLO members such as Kvinna till Kvinn, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, Crisis Management Initiative and Swisspeace have produced reports and operational guidance related to dialogue, women’s participation and gender issues – much of which has been funded directly by EU institutions or member-states. In addition the EU supports UNWOMEN, the African Union, and the UN Mediation Support Project on these issues Indeed the EU IFS is funding the gender adviser on the UN standby team with the agreement that this expertise can be drawn upon by EU. There is therefore a significant amount of international expertise and insight upon which EU officials can draw.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Key questions to inform the EU’s engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediation and Dialogue General – EU’s own capabilities</strong></td>
<td>What message is the EU sending through its own involvement of women in its own institutions, teams, or personnel relevant to mediation and dialogue, both in a particular geographic context and institutionally (is it positive or negative)? Are there windows of opportunity to increase the number of women in EU positions directly or indirectly involved in a process of mediation and dialogue if this is not satisfactory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to do it:</strong></td>
<td>Appointing and monitoring the progress of the appointment of women to positions such as senior EEAS staff, EUSRs, Heads of Delegation, EU-HOM. If actual appointment is not undertaken for whatever reason what complementary measures can be deployed? (e.g. drawing on women members of EU-HOMs to represent the EU; female EU senior advisers to peace processes/dialogue; senior relevant female members of staff of the EEAS, and MEPs to be brought into the processes of dialogue and mediation; gender advisors appointed or available to those leading EU mediation and dialogue activities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediation and Dialogue General – third parties</strong></td>
<td>In relation to the on-going conflict, what is the current position of women formally or informally and how is gender constructed in a) society and conflict dynamics more broadly; b) any nascent or on-going process of mediation or dialogue – i.e. in what role, and at what level? Does the EU have gender disaggregated data related to the context, peace process or specific processes of mediation and dialogue? Does the EU regularly meet with and listen to women locally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to do it:</strong></td>
<td>By 1) ensuring political economy and conflict analysis takes account of formal and informal power structures and gender relations and 2) mapping women’s engagement at both the individual and institutional level (including women’s organisations) in any on-going processes of dialogue and mediation 3) investing in gender disaggregated data. Mediators and those involved with mediation frequently bring in external expertise on power sharing, security sector reform and constitution making, so can also recognise that gender analysis is a technical skill that can be brought in. NB/draw on the knowledge and experience of EU Delegations (including gender focal point), EUSR staff, EEAS, Commission, other like-minded donors, UN agencies, UNWOMEN, international and local civil society, European NGOs (see box 9) any government offices / ministries with a focus on women. EU officials (from the highest level down) should regularly meet with, and listen to, women and women’s groups. 4) Ensure EU official meet with women’s groups, formally and informally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leveraging mediation and dialogue</strong></td>
<td>Does the EU have any soft or hard leverage in the current or emerging processes of mediation and dialogue to promote women’s participation and the addressing of gender issues; how would the use of this leverage be received and what are the opportunities and risks of promoting women’s participation and a gender perspective? Leverage may come from relations with the negotiating parties, funding of processes of dialogue, or through the EU’s action towards women’s groups and women participants themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to do it:</strong></td>
<td>Make women’s participation and the addressing of gender issues a central and important part of the dialogue that the EU has with any direct parties to the mediation or any third-party mediator (e.g. UN, AU, regional power). Continue to reference global commitments (e.g. UNSCR 1325, UNSCR 1889) to women’s representation and gender issues so as to avoid falling into the trap of the EU being accused of imposing its own values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting mediation and dialogue</strong></td>
<td>Are there experiences that the EU itself has either of the participation of women or the addressing of gender issues in mediation and dialogue that can be usefully promoted or drawn on in engagement with current parties to the conflict, or local women’s groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to do it:</strong></td>
<td>Promote the role of HRVP Ashton in order to showcase that women have been involved at the highest levels of EU mediation and dialogue; promote the role of specific experiences such as that of the Northern Ireland Women’s Coalition in order to address stereotypes and barriers to the participation of women in mediation and dialogue or to showcase learning on how this has been done; look to utilise the experience of senior women from across EU institutions (Parliament, Commissioners, member-state politicians) or undertake supporting mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting mediation and dialogue</strong></td>
<td>What expertise, technical skills or experience related to women’s participation or gender issues needs to be made available to the mediators (if not the EU) or to the parties to the conflict themselves; can the EU assist directly or indirectly? Assess what support is required by others promoting women’s participation or the inclusion of gender (e.g. local women’s groups, women politicians, or third parties such as the UN or regional organisations). Is there sufficient networking within women’s groups locally, nationally and regionally to support their participation and engagement in gender issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to do it:</strong></td>
<td>Analyse what specific gender expertise is available to the EU (including from within member-states), UN, or civil society internationally and locally (including whether accessing the gender expert on the UN standby team is available). Read reports such as Make Room for Peace – a guide to women’s participation in peace processes). Assess how relevant this is to the particular conflict and how the EU can facilitate access to this knowledge in order to inform any processes of dialogue and mediation. Assess what are the barriers to utilising this knowledge (availability, expertise, demand, funding mechanisms, acceptance of parties) and how these barriers can be overcome within EU processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding mediation and dialogue</strong></td>
<td>Is there any specific opportunity to make use of the general IFS EU funding available for specific women’s participation and gender expertise related to mediation and dialogue processes? If not what other funding mechanisms can be drawn on to support the legitimate and representative engagement of women at all levels from Track 1 to Track 3? Is funding a barrier to gender expertise? Is funding itself “gender-sensitive” in the sense that it is assisting women to address barriers to participation (i.e. is it funding for the long-term, is it flexible, can it be used to address factors hindering women’s participation such as supplementary child-care)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How to do it:</strong></td>
<td>Check with FP/EUEAS KO on overarching funding to women’s participation and gender expertise in terms of its availability for specific geographic contexts. Utilise the IFS, EIDHR, Africa Peace Facility, ENP, or other resources to support women’s participation, the utilisation of gender expertise, or local civil society organisations (women’s groups) to participate in or run parallel processes. Assess whether “calls for proposals” or more direct approaches and flexible support are the most appropriate (using specific Commission regulations that allow for this). Potentially make support to higher-level processes of dialogue or the funding of tangible aspects emerging from the agreements conditional to women’s participation and the addressing of gender issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Endnotes:

For reasons of space full explanation of the commitment and consequences of United Nations Resolutions is not given here. A useful short guide and critical analysis has been produced by the Initiative for Inclusive Security and can be found at: <http://www.peacewomen.org/assets/file/Resources/NGO/1325-1820-1888-1889-wps_unscrs_iis_sept2010.pdf>


3 Ibid


17 See for example, UNWOMEN, 2012: Women’s Participation in Peace Negotiations: Connections between Presence and Influence, UNWOMEN Sourcebook, p. 15.
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