

Women, Peace, and Security



ABOUT THE INDEPENDENT COMMISSION ON MULTILATERALISM

The Independent Commission on Multilateralism (ICM) is a project of the International Peace Institute (IPI). It asks: How can the UN-based multilateral system be made more “fit for purpose”?

In answering that question, the ICM has analyzed fifteen topics. These include armed conflict, humanitarian engagements, sustainable development, and global public health, among others (see complete list in Annex 2). The goal of the ICM is to make specific recommendations on how the UN and its member states can improve responses to current challenges and opportunities.

The ICM undertook simultaneous tracks of research and consultation for each issue area on its agenda. The Commission initially launched in New York in September 2014, followed by subsequent launches in Vienna, Geneva, and Ottawa. In February 2015, the ICM briefed delegates from the five UN Regional Groups in New York. The Commission also convened meetings with Ambassadorial and Ministerial Boards in New York, Vienna, and Geneva. Global outreach included briefings to officials in Addis Ababa, Berlin, Brasilia, Copenhagen, New Delhi, London, Madrid, Montevideo, and Rome. Civil society and private sector outreach and engagement also constituted an important component of the ICM’s consultative process, including a briefing specifically for civil society in June 2015.

The research process began with a short “issue paper” highlighting core debates and questions on each of the fifteen topics. Each issue paper was discussed at a retreat bringing together thirty to thirty-five member state representatives, UN officials, experts, academics, and representatives from civil society and the private sector. Based on the inputs gathered at the retreats, each issue paper was then revised and expanded into a “discussion paper.” Each of these was uploaded to the ICM website for comment and feedback, revised accordingly, and presented at a public consultation. The public consultations were webcast live on the ICM’s website to allow a broader audience to take part in the discussions.

This paper is one of the fifteen final “policy papers” that emerged from this consultative process. An overview of participation in consultations on this specific issue area is included in Annex 3. The recommendations from all the policy papers are summarized in the ICM’s September 2016 report “Pulling Together: The Multilateral System and Its Future.”

The ICM thanks the three sponsoring governments for their financial support for its operations: Canada, Norway, and the United Arab Emirates. Without their support, the ICM would not have been possible.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
Current Debates on Women, Peace, and Security	5
Challenging Traditional Concepts of Peace and Security	5
Reimagining the Goals of Peacemaking	7
Who Are the Women? Where Are the Men?	8
Institutional Challenges	9
Lack of Accountability and Political Will for Implementation	9
Overlooking Male Champions and Civil Society Partners	9
Fragmented Approach to Implementation	10
Conclusions and Recommendations	12
Reimagine Traditional Approaches to Peace and Security	12
Achieve a Unified, Holistic, and Coherent Approach	12
Build an Inclusive and Legitimate Multilateral System	13
Move from Norm Setting to Implementation	14
Apply the Agenda in a Coherent Way	14
Increase Accountability and Risk Assessment	14
Translate Normative Frameworks Literally and Culturally	15
Engage and Encourage Male Champions of Equality	15
Partner to Do Business Differently	15
Annexes	17
Annex 1: ICM Personnel	17
Annex 2: ICM Policy Papers	20
Annex 3: Participation in Consultations	21
Annex 4: UN Resolutions on Women, Peace, and Security	23
Annex 5: Key Literature on Women, Peace, and Security	25

Executive Summary

Over the past two decades, an abundance of legal and policy frameworks in the multilateral system have focused on women's security and empowerment. The international community has sought to address violence against women and women's full and equal participation since the 1995 World Conference on Women in Beijing. At the United Nations, the Security Council connected women's security with peace more broadly in 2000 when it placed women, peace, and security on the international agenda with Resolution 1325—and again in 2015 when it invited the secretary-general to commission a study on this resolution's implementation. The Security Council has passed seven more resolutions on the topic in the intervening years. The creation of UN Women in 2011 showed that gender equality is now recognized as a cross-cutting challenge in international affairs.

However, women continue to be poorly represented in formal peacemaking activities, and they suffer disproportionately from the indirect effects of conflict. International laws on conflict-related sexual violence are advancing, but patterns of behavior on the ground appear slow to change. While change undoubtedly requires concerted action at the individual and societal levels, there are also gaps, challenges, and tensions in the multilateral approach that are impeding progress.

The credibility of the multilateral system itself depends on progress in this area. Even as the multilateral system—in particular the UN Security Council, which serves as the home of the women, peace, and security agenda—continues to prioritize state security over human security, there is now compelling evidence that women's physical security and gender equality in society are associated with broader peace and stability in states. There is growing recognition that inclusive societies that provide equal opportunity for all are more likely to be peaceful and stable. Inclusion and inclusive development are increasingly seen as core elements

of conflict prevention.

Today, many states are under stress in large part because of their exclusive nature and lack of legitimacy, both of which are reflected in the state-based multilateral system. A multilateral system built on exclusive states and exclusive structures is not sustainable. Amid widespread calls for a return to the foundational principle of “we the peoples,” states and the organizations they create cannot ignore the priorities of half their populations.

The women, peace, and security agenda raises significant questions about how the multilateral system conceives of peace and security and whose interests it is prioritizing. These fundamental questions underlie the institutional gaps and challenges faced in implementing the agenda and accelerating progress for women and for peace. To improve multilateral engagement on women, peace, and security, several major shifts are needed:

1. **Reimagine traditional approaches to peace and security:** Advancing the women, peace, and security agenda may require a fundamental rethinking of the traditional approach to peace and security in the multilateral system—from conceptions of peace and security to the identification of key actors and the goals of peace processes.
2. **Achieve a unified, holistic, and coherent approach:** Improving women's security and increasing women's participation in managing and resolving conflict depends on multiple, related elements—from shifts in social norms to improvements in education and increased women's representation in politics and policy-making.
3. **Build an inclusive and legitimate multilateral system:** The empowerment of women as equal

citizens—and global citizens—could help to make the state-based multilateral system itself more legitimate, credible, and effective while also advancing the women, peace, and security agenda.

The following additional recommendations for the multilateral system aim to provide strategic entry points for action toward achieving these tasks: (1) move from norm setting to implementation; (2) concentrate on operationalizing the agenda in a coherent way; (3) increase accountability for added efficiency and effectiveness; (4) translate normative frameworks literally and culturally; (5) engage and encourage male champions of equality; and (6) partner to do business differently.

The transformative potential of women can only be unlocked by addressing their fundamental needs—

ensuring freedom from security threats and linking this agenda to their social and economic advancement. International actors can no longer separate peace and security from development if participation and gender equality are to advance. This has been recognized in the Sustainable Development Goals, which include critical links to women's empowerment.

As outlined above, the women, peace, and security agenda raises significant questions about how the multilateral system conceives of peace and security. Fundamental change in this realm requires high-level strategic engagement with key decision makers across the UN system, regional organizations, and member states. It also requires increased representation of women at decision-making levels in politics and foreign policy in general.

Introduction

Over the past two decades, there has been a profound change in the way the multilateral system addresses women's security. Widespread campaigns of sexual violence during conflicts in the 1990s, from Bosnia to Rwanda, prompted new investigations into conflict-related sexual violence and led to international recognition of rape as a deliberate strategy of war. As the 1995 World Conference on Women in Beijing identified women's security as a critical area of concern in times of both war and peace, a variety of international and regional fora began to shine a spotlight on other forms of violence against women.¹ Indeed, violence against women is now understood as a global phenomenon, affecting one in three women around the world and crossing geographic, economic, and social divides.²

These developments have gone hand in hand with an abundance of multilateral legal and policy frameworks focusing on women's security and empowerment. At the United Nations, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women recognized gender-based violence as a form of discrimination in 1992. Since then, states have used the UN General Assembly to issue numerous declarations on the need to eliminate violence against women in general and in its particular forms. The UN Security Council connected women's security with peace more broadly in 2000 when it placed women, peace, and security on the international agenda with Resolution 1325. It has passed six more resolutions on the topic in the

intervening years. The creation of UN Women in 2011 showed that gender equality is now recognized as a cross-cutting challenge in international affairs. It also demonstrated that the UN is capable of adapting to new needs and priorities through responsive institutional reform.

In 2015, the Security Council invited the secretary-general to commission a study on the implementation of Resolution 1325 to inform a high-level review that coincided with the resolution's fifteenth anniversary. The resulting report, *Preventing Conflict, Transforming Justice, Securing the Peace: A Global Study on the Implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325*, provided more than 400 pages of research and analysis, including the strongest evidence yet of the importance of women's participation. The Global Study calls on member states and multilateral actors to empower women throughout peace and transition processes "to bring the benefits of inclusiveness, representativeness, and diversity."³

However, multilateral policy advances and initiatives have struggled to realize progress for women in practice.⁴ Women continue to be poorly represented in formal peacemaking activities, and they suffer disproportionately from the indirect effects of conflict. International laws on conflict-related sexual violence are advancing, but patterns of behavior on the ground appear slow to change. Violence against women persists in developed as well as developing

1 United Nations, *Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, 4-5 September 1995*, New York, 1996. Not long before the Beijing Platform demanded more significant action from the international community on this issue, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women recognized gender-based violence as a form of discrimination in 1992; the UN General Assembly issued a Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women in 1993; and the Organization of American States adopted the Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of Violence against Women in 1994.

2 World Health Organization (WHO), *Global and Regional Estimates of Violence against Women: Prevalence and Health Effects of Intimate Partner Violence and Non-partner Sexual Violence*, Geneva, 2013.

3 UN Women, *Global Study on the Implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325*, 2015, p. 47.

4 The gaps and challenges listed in this paragraph and throughout the report are partly drawn from the data-driven review of twenty years of progress on women's security and stability by the Economist Intelligence Unit, Clinton Foundation, and Gates Foundation. For a summary, see Clinton Foundation and Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, "No Ceilings: The Full Participation Report," March 2015, chapter 2.

countries, and national action on domestic violence, sexual harassment, and rape varies greatly by region. While change undoubtedly requires concerted action at the individual and societal levels, there are also gaps, challenges, and tensions in the multilateral approach that are impeding progress. And progress in this area is something on which the credibility of the multilateral system itself—built on “we the peoples”—depends.

Based on extensive consultations with representatives of states, various UN entities, and civil society,

as well as subject-matter experts, this paper explores key challenges and developments related to women, peace, and security (see Annex 3 for an overview of the consultative process). As a starting point for discussion, it outlines some of the current debates in this area before exploring institutional challenges and opportunities. Finally, the paper offers conclusions and observations that can serve as strategic entry points for action and makes several recommendations for the multilateral system on operationalizing its policy commitments on women, peace, and security.

Current Debates on Women, Peace, and Security

Among other issues, current debates on women, peace, and security focus on (1) the place of women's security in the multilateral system's traditional conception of peace, (2) questions about efficacy and end goals in peacemaking, and (3) differing interpretations of "women" and "gender."

Challenging Traditional Concepts of Peace and Security

Despite significant advances in multilateral action on conflict-related sexual violence, core elements of the women, peace, and security agenda remain at odds with the dominant conceptions of peace and security in the multilateral system, which typically treats peace as the absence of direct physical violence ("negative" peace). This is illustrated in the different ways men and women experience insecurity. Men make up the majority of combatants during conflict and are more likely than women to die from war's direct effects. Women are more likely to die from war's indirect effects after conflict ends—from causes related to the breakdown in social order, human rights abuses, economic devastation, and the

spread of infectious diseases.⁵ Traditional understandings of peace and security fail to take these multidimensional threats to women's physical security into account. And for the most part, the system continues to treat "conflict" and "post-conflict" settings separately, based largely on the end of formal combat and the decline in the battle-related mortality rate.

Partly as a result of this approach, multilateral institutions have also tended to overlook domestic violence against women as a pervasive physical threat during conflict. Research shows that intimate-partner violence increases when conflict breaks out and is more prevalent than conflict-related sexual violence.⁶ Where domestic abuse is socially acceptable, combatants are likely to find it easier to legitimize extreme acts of violence against women.⁷ Similarly, levels of rape and domestic violence remain extremely high in post-conflict settings,⁸ as demobilized fighters confront transformed gender roles at home or the frustrations of unemployment, for example.

As such, the boundary between domestic violence

5 Thomas Plümpner and Eric Neumayer, "The Unequal Burden of War: The Effect of Armed Conflict on the Gender Gap in Life Expectancy," *International Organization* 60, no. 3 (2006); Kathleen Kuehnast, Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, and Helga Hernes, *Women and War: Power and Protection in the 21st Century* (Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace, 2011).

6 World Bank, *Global Monitoring Report: Promoting Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment*, Washington, DC, 2007; Erin Mooney, "The Concept of Internal Displacement and the Case for Internally Displaced Persons as a Category of Concern," *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (2005); Lori Heise and Claudia Garcia-Moreno, "Violence by Intimate Partners," in *World Report on Violence and Health*, edited by Etienne G. Krug et al., (Geneva: WHO, 2002), p. 100; Italo A. Gutierrez and José V. Gallegos, "The Effect of Civil Conflict on Domestic Violence: The Case of Peru," working paper, RAND Corporation, August 3, 2011, available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1904417>; Sarah Maguire, "Researching a Family Affair: Domestic Violence in FRY, Albania," in *Violence Against Women*, edited by Caroline Sweetman (Oxford: Oxfam, 1998).

7 See, for example, Jacqui True, *The Political Economy of Violence against Women* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Carol Cohn, ed., *Women and Wars* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2013).

8 See, for example, International Red Cross, "Report on Violence against Women from 1998–2003," Kigali, Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion, 2004, cited in True, *The Political Economy of Violence*, p. 149.

and conflict-related sexual violence is blurred. Conflict-related sexual violence may be understood as the extreme end of a continuum of gender-based discrimination. International actors seeking to end conflict-related sexual violence would likely also need to address the more hidden epidemic of domestic abuse and the root causes of violence against women. This demands a vision of “positive” peace—which connotes the absence of structural violence and the reinforcement of factors that sustain peaceful societies—and raises questions about how broad the scope of the women, peace, and security agenda should be.

Even as the multilateral system—in particular the UN Security Council, which serves as the home of the women, peace and security agenda—continues to prioritize state security over human security, there is now compelling evidence that women’s physical security and gender equality in society are also associated with broader peace and stability in states.⁹ According to the largest dataset on the status of women in the world to date, countries where women are more empowered are less likely to experience civil conflict or to go to war with their neighbors. While the causal direction remains unclear, quantitative analysis shows that women are more likely to face rape, domestic violence, and other physical threats in states with high rates of conflict, crime, and instability and in those that have poor relations with their neighbors or with the international community. Similarly, states are less likely to be peaceful if their family laws favor men or gender discrimination is prevalent in practice, despite equality under the law. Gender equality is a stronger predictor of a state’s peacefulness than its level of democracy, predominant religion, or gross domestic product (GDP).¹⁰

In addition, there is growing recognition that inclusive societies, which provide equal opportunity for all, are more likely to be peaceful and stable. Inclusion and inclusive development are increasingly seen as core elements of conflict prevention, as noted in the recent reports of the Advisory Group of Experts on the UN Peacebuilding Architecture and the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations.¹¹ There are calls to integrate inclusivity more fully into the work of the UN Security Council as well as other parts of the UN system and regional organizations.¹² Indeed, many states are under stress in large part because of their exclusive nature and concomitant lack of legitimacy, both of which are reflected in the state-based multilateral system. The empowerment of women as equal citizens—and global citizens—could therefore help to make the state-based multilateral system itself more legitimate, credible, and effective while also advancing the women, peace, and security agenda.

Further, new global challenges continue to emerge that were not at the forefront of the peace and security agenda when Resolution 1325 was adopted. Climate change is one such issue, and its impacts are not gender-neutral. Evidence suggests that while women are disproportionately affected by natural disasters, they are not fully involved in disaster risk management programs and often receive fewer relief benefits.¹³ From food and water scarcity to climate-related displacement, women are critical agents for early warning, recovery, and risk mitigation.

Since 2000, international attention has also turned to terrorism and violent extremism. Women in affected communities face the increased security threat of extremism and the negative impacts of increasingly securitized responses. Women are often

9 Valerie Hudson, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Mary Caprioli, and Chad F. Emmett, *Sex and World Peace* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012). On gender equality, see also, Mary Caprioli, “Primed for Violence: The Role of Gender Inequality in Predicting Internal Conflict,” *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (2005); Erik Melander, “Gender Equality and Intrastate Armed Conflict,” *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 4 (2005); Institute for Economics and Peace, “Pillars of Peace: Understanding the Key Attitudes and Institutions That Underpin Peaceful Societies,” 2013, p. 31.

10 Hudson et al., *Sex and World Peace*.

11 See United Nations, *The Challenge of Sustaining Peace: Report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture*, UN Doc. A/69/968-S/2015/490, June 30, 2015; and United Nations, *Uniting Our Strengths for Peace—Politics, Partnership, and People: Report of the High-Level Independent Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, June 16, 2015.

12 For example, the UN Security Council held an open debate on inclusive development for international peace and security in January 2015 under the presidency of Chile.

13 Elaine Enarson and P. G. Dhar Chakrabarti, *Women, Gender and Disaster: Global Issues and Initiatives* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2009), p. 307.

at the forefront of preventing and countering extremism, yet they are often overlooked by programs in these areas. However, more actors are beginning to recognize that the inclusion of women in the design and implementation of programs to prevent and counter violent extremism is critical to their success. For example, in Morocco and Algeria, government-supported programs engage women religious leaders and train them to identify and counter extremist beliefs.¹⁴

The women, peace, and security agenda can serve as a thread that brings together today's emerging threats and diverse challenges. These are key human security issues for the multilateral system, and the women, peace, and security agenda must continue to adapt to take these new realities into account.

Reimagining the Goals of Peacemaking

In addition to calling for the protection of women from violence, UN Security Council Resolution 1325 created a global framework for increasing women's participation in preventing, managing, and resolving conflict and called for "increased representation of women at all decision-making levels." However, progress has been difficult to realize in practice, particularly in the realm of high-level peacemaking. In formal peace processes between 1992 and 2011, women made up just 9 percent of negotiating delegations and 2 percent of chief mediators.¹⁵ Why is there such a gap between rhetoric and reality?

Traditionally, peace processes have sought to bring the belligerents—who are rarely women—to the negotiating table. These parties do not usually want to share power, and multilateral mediators and decision makers often find it difficult to create the space for new constituencies. Non-state armed groups that had previously been excluded were brought into peace processes in the 1990s, partly because of an increasing body of research on the

effects of their inclusion. Although women's participation in peacemaking can be seen as a right—as half of a society's population, women have a right to be represented in these decision-making processes that will affect their lives—peacemakers remain divided on the efficacy of their participation.

Many multilateral actors argue that models for inclusive and sustainable settlements are lacking, that time pressures associated with ending the violence do not allow for such a comprehensive approach, and that questions remain about the links between citizen engagement, the durability of peace, and the functioning of the state over time. Yet a growing body of research shows that when women participate meaningfully, the likelihood of a peace agreement being reached increases significantly and the chances it will be implemented are much higher.¹⁶ In addition, women who participate in peace processes often broaden the set of issues at the negotiating table to address the root causes of conflict, as well as women's needs and priorities.¹⁷ By incorporating development and human rights as well as security issues into negotiations, they frequently unify these three pillars of the United Nations in their approach.

While some may simply be unaware of the evidence of women's impact, a deeper resistance to women's participation is also at play. Indeed, women's participation is one element in a larger dilemma facing peace processes as they are currently structured. As demands for democracy, accountability, and meaningful representation grow in societies around the world, citizen participation and local buy-in are increasingly acknowledged as fundamental elements of effective peacebuilding.¹⁸ Yet as countries emerge from conflict, peacebuilding priorities are often determined behind closed doors in political settlements led by national and international elites that frequently fail to incorporate local knowledge and public expectations in the decision-making process. For instance, women play prominent roles in local

14 "Morocco Trains Female Spiritual Guides to Fight Extremism and Empower Women," PBS News Hour, May 20, 2015.

15 Based on a UN survey of women's participation in thirty-one major peace processes between 1992 and 2011. See UN Women, *Women's Participation in Peace Negotiations: Connections between Presence and Influence*, October 2012, p. 3.

16 Marie O'Reilly, Andrea Ó Súilleabháin, and Thania Paffenholz, "Reimagining Peacemaking: Women's Roles in Peace Processes," International Peace Institute, June 2015.

17 Sanam Naraghi-Anderlini, *Women Building Peace* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007).

18 Thania Paffenholz, ed., *Civil Society and Peacebuilding: A Critical Assessment* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2010).

mediation in Syria, negotiating humanitarian access and cease-fires at the community level, but they were largely excluded from formal peace talks convened in Geneva in early 2014.¹⁹ For some mediators and power brokers, opening the door to more constituencies—and particularly women, as a traditionally marginalized but heterogeneous group—calls time-honored mechanisms for peacemaking into question.

This raises a related quandary about whether the aim of a peace process should be to end violence or to create peace. Those who prioritize stabilization often think that the violent parties are the only legitimate participants, making women's participation less likely. On the other hand, if the goal of a peace process is to build peace, then it makes sense that individuals and groups who seek to build peace and who represent the diversity of the citizenry participate. Associated debates surround models for participation (e.g., should there be separate but linked fora for ending the violence versus building the peace?) and the relevance of traditional peace processes in light of the changing nature of conflict, the proliferation of mediation organizations, and the limited space afforded to multilateral mediators.

Who Are the Women? Where Are the Men?

It is now widely agreed that women experience conflict and violence in different ways than men and that their experiences are not adequately acknowledged and reflected in traditional international approaches to peace and conflict. However, when it comes to women's participation, tension frequently arises about the notion of grouping women under one banner. Critics argue that women also take up arms during conflict and can act as spoilers during peace processes. In addition, many women may not consider their gender as their dominant identity—they may feel better represented by their tribe, nationality, political affiliation, or some other identity marker. Nor will women necessarily articulate priori-

ties and needs that are shared among women or distinct from men's.

On the other hand, supporters of the women, peace, and security agenda recognize that women play a variety of roles during conflicts and represent diverse viewpoints and constituencies, just as men do. Still, they remain the minority of combatants and a marginalized and often discriminated group in society—particularly in conflict-affected contexts. Proponents of this agenda see the need for women's participation in its own right, as well as the importance of gender-sensitive approaches to conflict and peace—which can be carried out by women or men.

In parallel, there are increasing calls for a shift in emphasis from “women” to “gender” in peace and security, and a new focus on the roles that men and masculinity play in creating conflict and building peace. For example, while men are the majority of perpetrators of violence in times of war and peace, they also make up the majority of victims. And research shows that male identities—particularly men's interpretation of society's expectations of them—interact with other factors to explain why men are more likely to perpetrate violence or become combatants.²⁰

As knowledge about men's experiences and the motivators of violence improves, it is clear that policies for addressing violence and conflict need to account for the role that notions of masculinity play and the way that men's experiences impact cycles of violence and peace. This partly explains the impetus behind “gender mainstreaming”—incorporating the different implications for women and men into policymaking. Yet there are divergent perspectives on whether “women” or “gender” should take priority. And promoting both has led to some confusion among policymakers between “women” and “gender,” in some instances weakening the impact of both perspectives.

19 See Hibaq Osman, “Where Are the Syrian Women at the Geneva Peace Talks?” *The Guardian*, January 23, 2014; and Kristen Williams, “10 Ways Syrian Women Are Building Peace and Democracy,” Institute for Inclusive Security, February 21, 2014.

20 Joseph Vess, Gary Barker, Sanam Naraghi-Anderlini, and Alexa Hassink, “The Other Side of Gender: Men as Critical Agents of Change,” United States Institute of Peace, December 2013.

Institutional Challenges

The current debates and dilemmas in the area of women, peace, and security raise challenges at the institutional level in terms of (1) accountability and political will, (2) the limited involvement of men and society at large, and (3) the fragmented approach to implementation.

Lack of Accountability and Political Will for Implementation

The multilateral system, and the UN system in particular, has made great strides in advancing the normative framework for women, peace, and security. In addition to eight resolutions on the subject and multiple thematic debates at the UN Security Council, regional organizations have made numerous commitments to increase gender mainstreaming in peacebuilding policies. In 2014, for example, the African Union launched a five-year gender, peace, and security program to develop and implement mechanisms that increase women's participation. The program aims to accelerate the implementation of existing legal and policy commitments and develop new strategies to address women's exclusion and "engender a new peace and security discourse" on the continent.²¹

However, there have been challenges in holding states and multilateral actors accountable for their commitments. Just sixty-three countries had developed national action plans to implement Resolution 1325 by October 2016, and some argue that a focus on such technical mechanisms gives states the opportunity to sign up and do nothing. While multilateral frameworks provide a valuable foundation for collective action, a technical approach alone is unlikely to see the implementation of the women, peace, and security agenda in

practice. In addition to increasing the accountability of states and multilateral organizations to uphold their commitments, there needs to be a strategic and political push to accelerate progress.

This may require searching for additional fora to promote the agenda and to elevate it above the politics of the Security Council. While the attention of the permanent members of the council has been critical to advance the normative framework on women, peace, and security, the engagement of a broader set of member states and governments is necessary for progress on the ground. And to realize the potential of women in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, the agenda needs to be driven by diverse multilateral commitments, national policies, civil society strategies, and local community groups.

Overlooking Male Champions and Civil Society Partners

To a great extent, the women, peace, and security agenda in the multilateral system emerged from the global women's movement and was primarily (though not exclusively) driven by women. Despite the relationship between women's security and peace writ large, as well as the need for a fundamental shift in social norms, until recently the participation of men has been overlooked. Given the power that men wield in the multilateral system and across societies, men who champion the women, peace, and security agenda can become influential agents of change. Their buy-in is vital for the success of the agenda. It needs to be communicated more clearly—by multilateral organizations, research institutes, and advocacy groups—that women's security is in men's own interest if they seek more peaceful, stable societies. UN Women's #HeForShe

²¹ "African Union Launches Five-Year Gender Peace and Security Programme 2015–2020," African Union Commission Peace and Security Department, June 2, 2014, available at www.peaceau.org/en/article/african-union-launches-five-year-gender-peace-and-security-programme-2015-2020 .

campaign, which asks men to take a stand for gender equality, reflects this strategic approach.

The societal shifts needed to realize women's security and peace in practice also suggest that the multilateral system needs to engage more with society at large to accelerate progress. Change is required in families and communities as well as at the policy level. As evidenced by the Beijing Platform for Action in 1995, social movements for gender equality and women's empowerment can create significant momentum for policymaking and programming on the women, peace, and security agenda within the multilateral system while also contributing to a wider shift in norms that may reach broader constituencies.

In fact, research shows that strong women's movements are more important for reducing violence against women than a country's wealth or women's representation in politics and that women's participation in peace processes is more likely to be achieved when women's groups mobilize strongly within a country.²² For multilateral actors, these groups can be a source of innovative and creative approaches for effectively implementing the agenda in a way that makes sense in the local context and vernacular. As the Global Study on Resolution 1325 puts it, "What is 'political' in any given context must be interpreted in an inclusive manner involving extensive consultations with women's groups...as well as civil society as a whole."²³ These partners also play a crucial role in holding elites accountable for implementing their multilateral commitments.

Fragmented Approach to Implementation

Improved research into violence against women has led to a better understanding of the factors that influence it. At the societal level, violence against women appears most prevalent where violence more broadly is socially acceptable, in societies that exhibit broader gender inequality, and in fragile and conflict-affected contexts.²⁴ At the individual level, key risk factors for perpetrators and victims include low levels of education, poverty, exposure to maltreatment as children, attitudes accepting of violence, and excessive use of alcohol.²⁵ These findings present clear entry points for the multilateral system to improve women's security during both peace and conflict—and yet another reason to link these efforts to sustainable development.²⁶ They also reflect domains in which various parts of the multilateral system are already active, making the system well placed to intervene on the multiple levels required.

Yet the women, peace, and security agenda has largely been siloed in the UN Security Council, which has resulted in three key challenges to a coherent and effective approach:

- A focus on women's security in conflict settings that fails to recognize the continuum of violence women face across contexts of peace and conflict;
- A "securitization" of women's rights and gender equality that uses the tools of militarism and coercion to guide international action on what is a complex social problem;²⁷ and

22 Mala Htun and S. Laurel Weldon, "The Civic Origins of Progressive Change: Combating Violence Against Women in Global Perspective, 1975–2005," *American Political Science Review* 106, no. 3 (2012); O'Reilly, Ó Súilleabháin, and Paffenholz, "Reimagining Peacemaking."

23 UN Women, *Global Study*, p. 394.

24 Rachel Jewkes, "Intimate Partner Violence: Causes and Prevention," *The Lancet* 359, no. 9315 (2002); World Bank, *World Development Report 2012: Gender and Development*, Washington, DC, 2012, p. 367; Jeni Klugman and Lucia Hanmer, "Expanding Women's Agency: Where Do We Stand?" *Feminist Economics* (forthcoming), cited in Clinton Foundation and Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, "No Ceilings," pp. 22–23.

25 WHO and London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, "Preventing Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence against Women: Taking Action and Generating Evidence," Geneva, 2010.

26 There is now overwhelming evidence that women's participation in the economy also fuels economic growth. See, for example, World Bank, *Voice and Agency: Empowering Women and Girls for Shared Prosperity*, Washington, DC, 2014; Trish Tierney, ed., *Women in the Global Economy: Leading Social Change* (New York: Institute of International Education, 2013).

27 Natalie Florea Hudson, "Securitizing Women's Rights and Gender Equality," *Journal of Human Rights* 8, no. 1 (2009); UN Women, *Global Study*, p. 394.

- A superficial divide between the women, peace, and security agenda, on the one hand, and women's economic empowerment and sustainable development, on the other.

UN Women plays a key role in mainstreaming gender concerns across the UN system. Created as part of a previous UN reform agenda, it unified the work of previously distinct segments of the UN system that focused on women's empowerment.²⁸ It has made considerable strides toward uniting the multilateral approach, teaming up with the secretary-general and multiple UN offices on a variety of initiatives such as UNiTE to End Violence Against Women. It is also reaching far beyond the UN system to involve men across societies with innovative campaigns like #HeForShe and Planet 50/50.

Nonetheless, the UN system continues to struggle when it comes to linking the women, peace, and security agenda to gender equality more broadly and the necessary social and economic shifts. This results in a fragmented approach, with different parts of the system working on different elements relating to the agenda without connecting the dots and drawing synergies for implementation. Many senior management and staff throughout the system remain unaware or do not fully understand the relevance of women, peace, and security in their field of work. A lack of coherence among UN departments and agencies, as well as among regional organizations working on women's issues, has also posed challenges in terms of gathering data, measuring change, and agreeing on end goals for women's security and empowerment.

²⁸ These were the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and the Advancement of Women (OSAGI), Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW), and UN International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The women, peace, and security agenda raises significant questions about how the multilateral system conceives of peace and security and whose interests it is prioritizing. Such fundamental change in this realm requires high-level strategic engagement with key decision makers across the UN system, regional organizations, and member states. It also calls for increased representation of women at decision-making levels in politics and foreign policy in general. If women’s voices are still in such a minority in the UN Security Council and in national parliaments, how can the dominant narrative on peace and security reflect women’s perceptions of threats and priorities for peace?

The potential of women can only be unlocked by addressing fundamental needs—ensuring their freedom from security threats and linking this agenda to their social and economic development. International actors can no longer separate peace and security from development if participation and gender equality are to advance. The multilateral system must create measures, processes, and opportunities for women to participate equally and have accountability mechanisms to ensure progressive implementation. These aspirations and goals have struggled because there is not enough room conceptually for women to revisit the dominant paradigm for peace and security—a paradigm largely developed by officials in the Global North. Unless peace and security is redefined and integrated with the agendas of gender equality and broader participation, it will continue to be depicted in negative terms, as the absence of war instead of the development of stable and prosperous societies.

At this critical moment of renewed commitments to

women, peace, and security, the following recommendations offer strategic entry points for achieving overdue progress.

Reimagine Traditional Approaches to Peace and Security

Advancing the women, peace, and security agenda may require a fundamental rethinking of the traditional approach to peace and security in the multilateral system—from conceptions of peace and security to the identification of key actors and the goals of peace processes. To achieve progress in the security of women and of states, it may be necessary to shift the focus to a more holistic understanding of peace that goes beyond the absence of war and integrates the perceptions and priorities of those affected by peacemaking and peacekeeping who have previously been excluded.

As the Global Study on Resolution 1325 concluded, “there must be an end to the present cycle of militarization,” and “armed intervention by the international community and Member States must only be the last resort.”²⁹ Instead, the focus should be on prevention and a recognition that sustainable peace requires sustainable development.

Achieve a Unified, Holistic, and Coherent Approach

Improving women’s security and increasing women’s participation in managing and resolving conflict depends on multiple, related elements—from shifts in social norms to improvements in education and increased women’s representation in politics and policymaking. Yet women, peace, and security initia-

²⁹ UN Women, *Global Study*, p. 394.

tives within multilateral institutions often struggle to incorporate this bigger picture and connect to other initiatives seeking to bring about these changes.

At UN headquarters, the women, peace, and security agenda may have a unique role to play as a strategic connector because of its cross-cutting nature. The agenda has achieved both normative and operational targets across the fragmented organs and departments of the UN system; it is meant to inform staffing and analysis in peace operations, human rights investigations and accountability, and strategies to prevent violent extremism, as well as to lay the foundations for sustainable development.³⁰ But if the agenda remains fragmented and siloed, continues to be implemented through a largely technical approach, and fails to engage sufficiently with men and movements outside of the multilateral sphere, progress is likely to stall.

In this respect, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals present a significant opportunity. The inclusion of a target on eliminating all forms of violence against women within the goal on gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as a goal on "peaceful and inclusive societies," could serve to unify national and international efforts to improve gender equality and send a clear signal that women's leadership and participation matters for both peace and development.³¹

Build an Inclusive and Legitimate Multilateral System

Although international frameworks have advanced, the evidence linking gender equality and peace remains poorly understood among policymakers and society at large. Although many acknowledge that empowering women is good for societies, the specific impact this acknowledgment has on promoting and sustaining peaceful societies remains under-explored. At the same time, there is little consensus on the best way to advance women's

participation in policymaking and peacemaking.

A multilateral system built on exclusive states and exclusive structures is unlikely to overcome these challenges; nor is it sustainable. Amid widespread calls for a return to the foundational principle of "we the peoples," states and the organizations they create cannot ignore the priorities of half their populations. Women's empowerment and gender equality more broadly are necessary for a credible, legitimate, and effective multilateral system. Multilateral actors should evaluate whether the perspectives of people in conflict-affected communities are routinely consulted and taken into account; they should continually reexamine their understanding and operational definitions of ownership and inclusivity in mediation, peace processes, and peacebuilding initiatives.

The year 2015 marked notable anniversaries of two significant milestones in global initiatives for women's security and peace in society: the twentieth anniversary of the 1995 Platform for Action in Beijing and the fifteenth anniversary of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 in 2000. The increase in awareness and understanding of the need for women's empowerment, the nature of violence against women, and the links between inclusivity and development over the last two decades provided a unique moment to begin to tackle this global challenge with accelerated momentum and more strategic interventions at the multilateral level. On October 13, 2015, the Security Council convened a high-level review of women, peace, and security, where member states made new and renewed commitments to implement the agenda. On October 25, 2016, member states returned to the council to report on their efforts to implement these commitments one year on. Member states, the UN, regional organizations, and civil society should continue to bring attention to their achievements, gaps, and challenges in harnessing the full potential of gender equality.

³⁰ Arthur Boutellis and Andrea Ó Súilleabháin, "Working Together for Peace: Synergies and Connectors for Implementing the 2015 UN Reviews," International Peace Institute, May 2016, p. 6.

³¹ See UN General Assembly, *Report of the Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals*, UN Doc. A/68/970, August 12, 2014.

Move from Norm Setting to Implementation

In practice, resistance to implementing the women, peace, and security agenda within states and multilateral organizations is only partly explained by rational debates. Much of the resistance relates to who holds power and a reluctance to share it; this could be mitigated by a committed leadership and enlightened interpretation of social norms and values. A political push and technical tools are needed to accompany the normative advance. With progressive leadership, the issue can be moved beyond a normative framework to real implementation. And implementation should not only be measured through indicators and “box-ticking” exercises, but also through evidence of broader societal transformation.

While many multilateral tools are no longer “fit for purpose” to address current problems, the UN has entry points to take a holistic approach to peace and gender equality. Responses and programs should be linked up at headquarters. But even more importantly, peace operations, peacebuilding initiatives, development programs, and other multilateral responses should be linked to the effects of violence and insecurity on ordinary people.

Apply the Agenda in a Coherent Way

The United Nations and its member states can locate synergies among the 2015 reports of the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, the review of the UN peacebuilding architecture, and the Global Study on Resolution 1325. These synergies would help break the women, peace, and security agenda out of its silo by integrating it across development, humanitarian action, and peace and security agendas at large. The Global Study highlighted the following priorities: consistent implementation by the Security Council, strengthening the gender architecture of the UN system, removing obstacles and incentivizing greater participation of women in peace and security, and increasing financing and accountability for women, peace, and security commitments. Women, peace, and security issues

can be strategically linked to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as well as the sustaining peace framework adopted by the General Assembly and Security Council in April 2016, both key opportunities to elevate the debate on this agenda.

Proponents of women, peace, and security have advocated for a “field first” approach, in parallel to the call of the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations for a people-centered approach. Still, there is a need for UN departments to work together to address implementation and encourage member states to take the lead by translating international norms into domestic legislation and policies. Member states, for their part, can advocate for coherence in the UN system and push for reforms that break down institutional silos. Across the world, critical operationalization takes place on the ground, and a key issue for the UN is how to empower special representatives of the secretary-general (SRSGs) to implement these commitments in their missions. Authority should be delegated from headquarters to field operations, alongside a vastly increased appointment of women SRSGs and special envoys.

Increase Accountability and Risk Assessment

At UN headquarters and in their reporting to the Security Council, SRSGs still rarely report on women, peace, and security or gender issues. This has improved incrementally in 2016, after the Security Council established an informal expert group on women, peace, and security “to maximize information, monitoring and support capacity from the UN system as a whole,” as recommended by the Global Study. Beyond the council, accountability for women’s participation and broader social inclusion relates to the legitimacy of the UN system as a whole, from headquarters to the community level. If the system is built on exclusivity, its irrelevance will be underscored.³²

In addition to increased accountability for implementation of standing commitments, multilateral planning must assess possible unintended consequences of proposed programs on women and

³² UN Women, *Global Study*, p. 413.

gender equality. When women are upheld as champions of equality in their countries, they may receive additional resources and support. However, they may also be put at risk, with negative impacts for their personal security. In other cases, post-conflict funding, reparations programs, or demobilization packages leave women out entirely. This systematic exclusion of women from post-conflict recovery programs overlooks the diverse and important roles that they play in conflict and peacebuilding, as outlined above. Where these programmatic errors have negative consequences, the UN and multilateral actors should be accountable and seek to repair damage to women leaders and women's organizations.

Translate Normative Frameworks Literally and Culturally

From skilled civil servants in capitals around the world to religious leaders in traditional communities, many people still do not understand the 1325 agenda or the actions it requires. There is a need to translate the women, peace, and security agenda into something comprehensible and to recognize the importance of strategic communication and messaging to create momentum.

By translating the policies and practices of the women, peace, and security agenda into accessible resources in many languages, a broader subset of global society can be reached. Further, by reinterpreting the agenda according to local customs or through the lens of religious norms, community leaders can harness the potential of the women, peace, and security framework in their work for progressive change.

Engage and Encourage Male Champions of Equality

As noted above, in many societies, the principal actors in bringing change on gender equality will be men, who continue to hold the majority of positions in policymaking and the public sector worldwide.

The problem of masculinity as it is classically articulated cuts across regions and cultures. More research that examines masculinity is needed to ask how we can change psychologies and mindsets about an equitable space for women.

Throughout the 2015–2016 campaign for secretary-general, there was a call for the United Nations to elect a woman—labeled the #She4SG campaign on social media.³³ Despite the candidacies of qualified women from Eastern Europe and elsewhere, on October 6, 2016, the Security Council selected António Guterres of Portugal to lead the UN for the next five years. As he prepares to take the UN's highest post, Guterres has pledged to be a male champion of gender equality, and his transition team makes good on that promise—the five-member team includes three women. The true test will be whether Guterres upholds this parity in his appointment of senior leaders and whether he encourages gender equality in key mission and field posts—from SRSGs and special envoys to peace and development advisers.

Partner to Do Business Differently

Greater synergies can be drawn from connecting bottom-up and top-down efforts and uniting men and women in the search for gender equality through partnerships that help the UN do business differently. For example, gender-sensitive context analysis can help multilateral actors to identify leaders at the grassroots level and in other walks of life and support them as catalysts for change. Ideally, such tools can be participatory, bringing together diverse local actors to contribute knowledge and analysis. That approach, already pursued by some large peace and humanitarian NGOs, can be a peacebuilding initiative in itself by modeling political inclusion and a democratic process.

The practical tool of joint context and conflict analysis by various divisions of the UN, NGOs, and the private sector could map not only sources of violence and risk, but also peaceful actors and

³³ See, for example, Editorial Board, "The Push for a Woman to Run the U.N.," *New York Times*, August 22, 2015; and "General Assembly Adopts Historic Resolution on Improving Sec-Gen Selection," 1 for 7 Billion Campaign, September 14, 2015, available at www.1for7billion.org/news/2015/9/14/general-assembly-adopts-historic-resolution-on-improving-sec-gen-selection.

sources of resilience. Within the UN, there is great potential for analysis and planning for peace operations or peacebuilding that draws on UN Women's extensive networks of women peace actors in conflict countries. At the moment, the rich local knowledge that could be collected in UN field

programs is overlooked and often not reported to mission leadership in the field or peacebuilding offices at headquarters. This leaves out information on the negative impacts of conflict on women and the critical roles they are playing to make and build peace.

Annex 1: ICM Personnel

Co-chairs

HE Mr. Kevin Rudd, *Australia* (Chair)
HE Mr. Børge Brende, *Norway*
HE Ms. Hannah Tetteh, *Ghana*
HE Mr. José Manuel Ramos-Horta, *Timor-Leste*
HE Ms. Patricia Espinosa Cantellano, *Mexico*
(2014–July 2016)

Ministerial Board

HE Mr. Jean Asselborn, *Luxembourg*
HE Mr. Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu, *Turkey*
HE Mr. Stéphane Dion, *Canada*
HE Ms. Aurelia Frick, *Liechtenstein*
Sh. Khaled Al Khalifa, *Bahrain*
HE Mr. Sebastian Kurz, *Austria*
HE Ms. Retno Marsudi, *Indonesia*
HE Mr. Heraldo Muñoz, *Chile*
Sh. Abdullah Al Nahyan, *UAE*
HE Ms. Netumbo Nandi-Ndaitwah, *Namibia*
HE Mr. Sameh Shoukry Selim, *Egypt*

Geneva Ambassadorial Board

HE Ms. Marianne Odette Bibalou, *Gabon*
HE Ms. Regina Dunlop, *Brazil*
HE Mr. Alexandre Fasel, *Switzerland*
HE Ms. María Fernanda Espinosa Garcés, *Ecuador*
HE Mr. Jean-Marc Hoscheit, *Luxembourg*
HE Ms. Nazhat Shameem Khan, *Fiji*
HE Mr. Steffen Kongstad, *Norway*
HE Mr. Ajit Kumar, *India*
HE Ms. Saja Majali, *Jordan*
HE Ms. Marta Maurás Pérez, *Chile*
HE Ms. Rosemary McCarney, *Canada*
HE Mr. Vaanchig Purevdorj, *Mongolia*
HE Mr. Amr Ramadan, *Egypt*
HE Mr. Carsten Staur, *Denmark*
HE Ms. Yvette Stevens, *Sierra Leone*
HE Mr. Thani Thongphakdi, *Thailand*
HE Mr. Roderick van Schreven, *Netherlands*
HE Mr. Obaid Salem Al Zaabi, *UAE*

New York Ambassadorial Board

HE Mr. Amr Abdellatif Aboulatta, *Egypt*
HE Mr. Brian Bowler, *Malawi*
HE Mr. Harald Braun, *Germany*
HE Mr. Yaşar Halit Çevik, *Turkey*
HE Mr. Vitaly Churkin, *Russia*
HE Mr. Vladimir Drobnjak, *Croatia*
HE Mr. Michael Grant, *Canada*
HE Mr. Einar Gunnarsson, *Iceland*
HE Mr. Mohamed Khaled Khiari, *Tunisia*
HE Ms. Lana Zaki Nusseibeh, *UAE*
HE Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, *Brazil*
HE Mr. Geir O. Pedersen, *Norway*
HE Mr. Amrith Rohan Perera, *Sri Lanka*
HE Mr. Nawaf Salam, *Lebanon*
HE Mr. Fodé Seck, *Senegal*
HE Mr. Karel van Oosterom, *Netherlands*
HE Mr. Christian Wenaweser, *Liechtenstein*
HE Mr. Jean-Francis Régis Zinsou, *Benin*

Vienna Ambassadorial Board

HE Ms. Olga Algayerova, *Slovakia*
HE Ms. Bente Angell-Hansen, *Norway*
HE Mr. Abel Adelakun Ayoko, *Nigeria*
HE Mr. Mark Bailey, *Canada*
HE Ms. Maria Zeneida Angara Collinson, *Philippines*
HE Mr. Mehmet Hasan Göğüş, *Turkey*
HE Mr. Rajiva Misra, *India*
HE Mr. Michael Adipo Okoth Oyugi, *Kenya*
HE Mr. Kairat Sarybay, *Kazakhstan*
HE Mr. Gonzalo de Salazar Serantes, *Spain*
HE Ms. Christine Stix-Hackl, *Austria*
HE Mr. Claude Wild, *Switzerland*

Conveners

Terje Rød-Larsen, President,
International Peace Institute
Walter Kemp, Senior Vice President,
International Peace Institute

ICM Secretariat

Hardeep Singh Puri, Secretary-General
(September 2014–March 2016)

Barbara Gibson, Secretary-General
Adam Lupel, Vice President, IPI

Els Debuf, Senior Adviser

Ariun Enkhsaikhan, Research Assistant

Omar El Okdah, Senior Policy Analyst

Warren Hoge, Senior Adviser

Jimena Leiva Roesch, Senior Policy Analyst

Youssef Mahmoud, Senior Adviser

Andrea Ó Súilleabháin, Senior Policy Analyst

Véronique Pepin-Hallé, Adviser

Asteya Percaya, Intern

Anette Ringnes, Research Assistant

Rodrigo Saad, External Relations Coordinator

Margaret Williams, Policy Analyst

IPI Publications

Albert Trithart, Assistant Editor

Madeline Brennan, Assistant Production Editor

IPI Web and Multimedia

Jill Stoddard, Director of Web & Multimedia
and Web Editor

Nadia Mughal, Digital Content Producer

Thong Nguyen, Program Administrator

Hillary Saviello, Assistant Web Editor

Annex 2: ICM Policy Papers

This is one in a series of fifteen issue-specific policy papers that the Independent Commission on Multilateralism (ICM) is publishing over the course of 2016 and 2017. These papers cover in greater detail issue areas addressed in ICM's September 2016 report "Pulling Together: The Multilateral System and Its Future." The fifteen policy papers (not in order of publication) are as follows:

- Armed Conflict: Mediation, Peacebuilding, and Peacekeeping
- Climate Change and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
- Communication Strategy for the UN Multilateral System
- Engaging, Supporting, and Empowering Global Youth
- Forced Displacement, Refugees, and Migration
- Fragile States and Fragile Cities
- Global Pandemics and Global Public Health
- Humanitarian Engagements
- Impact of New Technologies on Peace, Security, and Development
- Justice and Human Rights
- Social Inclusion, Political Participation, and Effective Governance
- Terrorism and Organized Crime
- The UN, Regional Organizations, Civil Society, and the Private Sector
- Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-proliferation and Disarmament
- Women, Peace, and Security

Annex 3: Participation in Consultations

Retreat: June 19–20, 2015 (Greentree Estate, Manhasset, New York)

Keynote Speaker

Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, *United Nations Under-Secretary-General and Executive Director, UN Women*

Participants

Rina Amiri, *Senior Research Associate, Princeton University*

Stefan Barriga, *Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Principality of Liechtenstein to the United Nations*

Jeanne d'Arc Byaje, *Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Rwanda to the United Nations*

Maya Dagher, *Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Lebanon to the United Nations*

Vladimir Drobnjak, *Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Croatia to the United Nations*

Constance Emefa Edjeani-Afenu, *Deputy Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Ghana to the United Nations*

Bénédicte Frankinet, *Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Belgium to the United Nations*

Barbara Gibson, *Senior Adviser, Independent Commission on Multilateralism*

Einar Gunnarsson, *Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Iceland to the United Nations*

Warren Hoge, *Senior Adviser for External Relations, International Peace Institute*

Jimena Leiva-Roesch, *Policy Analyst, International Peace Institute*

Adam Lupel, *Director of Research and Publications, International Peace Institute*

Youssef Mahmoud, *Senior Adviser, International Peace Institute & Member of UN High Level Advisory Group for the Global Study on Security Council Resolution 1325*

Shadia Marhaban, *Consultant, United Nations Development Programme & Founder, Aceh Women's League*

Nadia Mughal, *Digital Content Producer, Independent Commission on Multilateralism*

Alaa Murabit, *Founder and President, The Voice of Libyan Women*

Lana Nusseibeh, *Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Arab Emirates to the United Nations*

Darelle O'Keefe, *Political Adviser, Permanent Mission of Ireland to the United Nations*

Jacqueline O'Neill, *Director, Institute for Inclusive Security*

Marie O'Reilly, *Editor and Research Fellow, International Peace Institute*

Andrea Ó Súilleabháin, *Senior Policy Analyst, International Peace Institute*

Omar El Okdah, *Senior Policy Analyst, International Peace Institute*

Michael Okwudili, *Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations*

Román Oyarzun Marchesi, *Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations*

Thania Paffenholz, *Project Director and Senior Researcher, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva*

Donica Pottie, *Director, Department of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Development, Canada*

Antonia Potter Prentice, *Senior Manager, Gender and Inclusion, Crisis Management Initiative*

Hardeep Singh Puri, *Secretary-General, Independent Commission on Multilateralism*

Anette Ringnes, *Research Assistant, International Peace Institute*

Kevin Rudd, *Chair, Independent Commission on Multilateralism*

Rodrigo Saad, *Special Assistant to the Vice President and the Independent Commission on Multilateralism, International Peace Institute*

Graeme Neil Simpson, *Director, Interpeace USA & Adjunct Lecturer, Columbia School of Law*

Nahla Valji, *Policy Adviser and Officer in Charge, Peace and Security Section, UN Women*

Public Consultation: November 4, 2015 (IPI, New York)

Discussants

Andrea Ó Súilleabháin, *Senior Policy Analyst, International Peace Institute*

Youssef Mahmoud, *Senior Adviser, International Peace Institute*

Nahla Valji, *Deputy Chief, Peace and Security, UN Women*

Louise Allen, *Executive Coordinator, NGO Working Group on Women, Peace, and Security*

Moderator

Barbara Gibson, *Deputy Secretary-General, Independent Commission on Multilateralism*

Research

Issue Area Lead: Andrea Ó Súilleabháin

Issue Expert: Marie O'Reilly

Annex 4: UN Resolutions on Women, Peace, and Security

Security Council

The UN Security Council has adopted eight resolutions focusing on women, peace, and security since 2000. Three resolutions have addressed the broad women, peace, and security agenda—across participation, protection, and prevention—and its implementation. Four have focused explicitly on conflict-related sexual violence. The most recent resolution is the first since Resolution 1325 to focus in particular on women’s contributions to peacemaking.

Resolution	Focus	Year
1325	Acknowledges a link between women’s experiences of conflict and the maintenance of international peace and security; urges women’s leadership and equal participation in conflict resolution and peacebuilding; requires gender mainstreaming for peace operations.	2000
1820	First resolution to recognize conflict-related sexual violence as a tactic of war; requires a response through peacekeeping, justice, services, and peace negotiations; emphasizes the need to increase women’s role in decision making on conflict prevention and resolution.	2008
1888	Strengthens tools to implement Resolution 1820, calling on the secretary-general to appoint a special representative on sexual violence in conflict; expresses concern regarding the lack of female mediators.	2009
1889	Calls for further strengthening of women’s participation in peace processes and the post-conflict period, as well as the development of indicators, monitoring, and reporting to measure progress on Resolution 1325.	2009
1960	Provides an accountability system for sexual violence in conflict, including by listing perpetrators; calls on the secretary-general to establish monitoring, analysis, and reporting arrangements for sexual violence; encourages efforts to increase the participation of women in formal peace processes.	2010
2106	Provides operational guidance on addressing sexual violence and calls for the further deployment of women protection advisers; calls on all actors to combat impunity for crimes of sexual violence in conflict.	2013

Resolution	Focus	Year
2122	Calls on all parties to peace talks to facilitate equal and full participation of women in decision making; aims to increase women's participation in peacemaking by increasing resources and improving information on women in conflict zones; acknowledges the critical contributions of women's civil society organizations to conflict prevention, resolution, and peacebuilding.	2013
2242	Takes into account the findings of the Global Study and the High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations; urges the secretary-general to put forth a new strategy to double the number of women in peacekeeping in five years; calls for scaled-up gender analysis and gender expertise across the mission cycle; calls for greater integration of the women, peace, and security agenda into efforts to counter violent extremism.	2015

General Assembly

A number of General Assembly resolutions since the early 1990s have focused on violence against women in different forms. The assembly's 1993 resolution on the elimination of violence against women followed the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women's *General Recommendation no. 19 on Violence Against Women* in 1992. The UN's *Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, 4-5 September 1995* also set the agenda for many of the specific issue areas addressed by the General Assembly in the years that followed.

Resolution	Title	Year
48/104	Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women	1993
54/133	Traditional or customary practices affecting the health of women and girls	1999
58/147	Elimination of domestic violence against women	2004
59/165	Working towards the elimination of crimes against women and girls committed in the name of honour	2004
62/132	Violence against women migrant workers	2007

Annex 5: Key Literature on Women, Peace, and Security

A variety of academic volumes offer a valuable overview of theories, histories, and practices surrounding women, war, and peace, including Carol Cohn's *Women and Wars* (Polity Press, 2013) and Jacqui True's *The Political Economy of Violence against Women* (Oxford University Press, 2012).

Statistical studies have explored the relationship between gender inequality and war, or gender equality and peace. In their book *Sex and World Peace* (Columbia University Press, 2012), Valerie Hudson, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Mary Caprioli, and Chad Emmett show that women's physical security and gender equality in society are correlated with broader peace and stability in states. Earlier, in 2005, Mary Caprioli established the role of gender inequality in predicting internal conflict in her article "Primed for Violence" in *International Studies Quarterly* (vol. 49, no. 2). In the same year, Erik Melander demonstrated that more equal societies, measured either in terms of female representation in parliament or the ratio of female-to-male higher education attainment, are associated with lower levels of intrastate armed conflict in his article "Gender Equality and Intrastate Armed Conflict" in *International Studies Quarterly* (vol. 49, no. 4).

A number of publications also explore women's roles in building peace and gender sensitivity in peace processes. Sanam Naraghi Anderlini's book *Women Building Peace: What They Do, Why It Matters* (Lynne Rienner, 2007) explores women's contributions to a plethora of peace and security processes around the world and traces the evolution of international policies in this arena. In 2010, Christine Bell and Catherine O'Rourke explored the impact of Resolution 1325 on peace processes by tracing gender equality and women's rights in peace agreements in "Peace Agreements or 'Pieces of Paper'?" *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* (vol. 59, no. 4).

Different organizations have also produced valuable short reports on these issues. UN Women's 2012 report *Women's Participation in Peace Negotiations: Connections between Presence and Influence*, provided much-needed figures on women's participation in peace processes. The Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue further examined women's rights and gender in peace agreements in their 2012 report "From Clause to Effect." In 2013, the International Peace Institute offered an overview of women's roles in high-level conflict mediation in the report "Women in Conflict Mediation: Why It Matters." In 2015, IPI published "Reimagining Peacemaking: Women's Roles in Peace Processes," which drew from an initial draft of this paper and Thania Paffenholz's research at the Graduate Institute in Geneva. Also in 2015, the Clinton Foundation and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation provided a data-driven overview of global progress on women's empowerment since 1995 in "No Ceilings: The Full Participation Report," which included a chapter dedicated to "ensuring security."

Finally, books exploring women's roles in fueling economic growth by creating stable societies include Trish Tierney's *Women in the Global Economy: Leading Social Change* (Institute of International Education, 2013) and the World Bank's *Voice and Agency: Empowering Women and Girls for Shared Prosperity* (2014).

Cover Photo: Women participate in an event organized by the UN Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) to raise awareness about gender violence and its implications, El Fasher, North Darfur, December 5, 2013. UNAMID/Albert González Farran.

Suggested Citation:

Independent Commission on Multilateralism, “Women, Peace, and Security,” New York: International Peace Institute, October 2016.

© by International Peace Institute, 2016
All Rights Reserved

www.ipinst.org
www.icm2016.org

The **INTERNATIONAL PEACE INSTITUTE** (IPI) is an independent, international not-for-profit think tank dedicated to managing risk and building resilience to promote peace, security, and sustainable development. To achieve its purpose, IPI employs a mix of policy research, strategic analysis, publishing, and convening. With staff from around the world and a broad range of academic fields, IPI has offices facing United Nations headquarters in New York and offices in Vienna and Manama.



777 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017-3521
USA
TEL +1-212 687-4300
FAX +1-212 983-8246

Freyung 3, 1010
Vienna, Austria
TEL +43-1-533-8881
FAX +43-1-533-8881-11

51-52 Harbour House
Bahrain Financial Harbour
P.O. Box 1467
Manama, Bahrain
TEL +973-1721-1344

www.ipinst.org

www.theglobalobservatory.org