

Women, Peace and Security in EU Common Security and Defence Policy

Author:

Giji Gya

Executive Director, [ISIS Europe](#)
and Associate Researcher, [FRIDE](#)
giji.gya@gmail.com

This paper was prepared in the framework of the Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN)
<http://www.eplo.org/civil-society-dialogue-network.html>

The paper was produced for discussion during a CSDN Policy Meeting entitled *EU-CSO Expert Meeting on Women, Peace and Security (WPS) in EU Common Security and Defence Policy Missions and Operations*, which took place on 21 June 2011 in Brussels, Belgium.

The views expressed in the paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the positions of the CSDN as a whole, or of EPLO, the European External Action Service or the European Commission.

Civil Society Dialogue Network

The Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) is a three-year project funded by the European Commission aimed at facilitating dialogue on peacebuilding issues between civil society and the EU institutions.

For more information about the Civil Society Dialogue Network, please visit the [EPLO website](#).

Table of Contents

1) A summary of the innovations brought by UNSCRs 1888, 1889 and 1960 on women, peace and security	2
Gaps to date of 1325/1820 that were sought to be addressed by 1888, 1889, 1960.....	2
Table 1 : Adapted from UNIFEM 2010/UNW 2011 – summary of UNSC resolutions on WPS following 1325 and 1820.	4
Assessment of EU Policy.....	6
Assessment of CSDP missions (gender reports and independent research).....	8
Analysis of the Taskforce capacity	10
Analysis of indicators process and positive impact (relevant to CSDP)	10
Analysis of gender standardisation in CSDP (GAs, documentation, training, lessons)	12
Conclusions.....	13
2) Recommendations on how to incorporate commitments included in the new UNSCRs on women, peace and security in the existing EU framework for implementation of WPS in CSDP.....	14
Assessment of recommendations to date to the EU	14
Recommendations for EAS and CMPD	16
Recommendations for CSDP missions.....	17
Recommendations for EU Member States.....	17

Methodology

This background briefing was prepared through a mix of first and second source material, including: an analysis of existing written materials, reports and recommendations; interviews with EU and mission staff and NGOs; minutes taken at the recent Taskforce meeting in May 2011 in Brussels; and answers to a straw-poll survey from a mix of NGOs, researchers and mission staff. Research and tables are to be attributed to Giji Gya. The views presented in this paper are the author's and do not necessarily represent EPLO, the CSDN or the EU institutions.

Abbreviations

BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CIVCOM	Council of the EU Committee on Civilian Aspects
CMPD	Crisis Management Planning Department (formerly the Civilian Military Planning Directorate), EAS
CONOPS	Concept of Operations
EUPOL COPPS	EU Police Advisory Mission in Occupied Territories of Palestine
CRT	Civilian Response Team
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
DG AIDCO	EU Directorate General EuropeAid
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EAS	European External Action Service
EC	European Commission
ESDC	European Security Defence College
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUBAM Rafah	European Union Border Assistance Mission in Rafah
EUJUST THEMIS	European Union Rule of Law Mission to Georgia
EUJUST LEX-Iraq	European Union Rule of Law Mission to Iraq
EULEX Kosovo	European Union Rule of Law Mission to Kosovo
EUPM BiH	European Union Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina
EUPOL DRC	European Union Police Mission in DRC
EUSEC DRC	EU advisory and assistance mission for security reform in the DRC
EUSR	European Union Special Representative
EUTM	European Union Training Mission
GA	Gender Advisor
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GFP	Gender Focal Point
GPS	Gender Peace and Security
HOM	Head of Mission
HRA	Arab Association for Human Rights
HR/VP	European Union High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and European Commission Vice-President
IDL	Internet-Based Advanced Distance Learning
ITC-ILO	International Training Centre of the International Labour Organization
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEP	Member of the European Parliament
NAP	National Action Plan (on UNSCR 1325)
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OpCdt	Operation Commander
OPLAN	Operations Plan
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PSC	Political and Security Committee of the EU
SEA	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
UNSG	UN Secretary General
SGBV	Sexual and Gender-Based Violence
SRSR	Special Representative of the UN Secretary General
SSR	Security Sector Reform

UN	United Nations
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
UNW	United Nations Women
VAW	Violence Against Women
WPA	Women Protection Advisor
WPS	Women Peace and Security

*“The process of the recent adoption of UNSCR 1960 sponsored by governments without consultation with women on the ground is a case in point. It speaks only of women as victims of sexual abuse during violent conflict and does not mention that if women were recognized as participants in decision making they would be less vulnerable to attack. If governments would involve more women and worked harder to prevent wars there would be less sexual abuse. If small arms were regulated and reduced by involving women in the decision making there would be less sexual violence. **If the UN leadership and its member states involved women more systematically in conflict prevention and resolution – the real focus of 1325 – there would be a marked improvement in peace and security for everyone.**”¹*

1) A summary of the innovations brought by UNSCRs 1888, 1889 and 1960 on women, peace and security

Gaps to date of 1325/1820 that were sought to be addressed by 1888, 1889, 1960

UNSCR 1325 aimed to address women and girls in peace and security by providing the first Resolution by the UN Security Council (UNSC) on this matter. Essentially, it recognised “that women’s exclusion from peace processes contravenes their rights, and that including women and gender perspectives in decision-making can strengthen prospects for sustainable peace. ... The landmark resolution specifically addresses the situation of women in armed conflict and calls for their participation at all levels of decision-making on conflict resolution and peacebuilding.”² The resolution forms a basis for what is known as a ‘PPP’ strategy: Protect women against violence; Prevent gender-based violence; and promote Participation of women in peace processes.

Despite UNSCR 1325 being a ground breaking resolution of the UNSC ten years ago, its implementation has been hindered by a lack of political will, organisational inertia and discriminatory attitudes. Many also point to the lack of guidelines, tools and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to ensure its implementation. Furthermore, scholars have outlined that 1325 has not made a significant contribution to the elimination of gender based stereotypes, or engaged men in implementing 1325. There has also been criticism that implementation of 1325 was either skewed quantitatively towards raising the numbers of women, or focusing on the ‘woman-as-victim’ in conflict.

Five to eight years after 1325, we had reached a point that the existence of 1325 was known, but apart from practitioners and advocates, little effort was made to know – let alone understand - what was in it and how to enact it. Similar to the problem of implementing lessons in other areas of security and peace policies, some saw it as too complex, others as difficult to implement. In order to address this, civil society organisations developed various guidelines and resource tools; from 2005, some states created national action plans to implement 1325 (NAPs)³; and 1325 was conceptualized by the UN into four pillars of: participation; prevention; protection; and relief and recovery to try to assist in concentrating on advancing 1325 across these areas. Yet, we have seen an increase in the attitude that 1325 and equality are a thing of the past (in particular the resistance by some Western states towards National Action Plans) or relegated to the old-no-need-to-continue bastion of ‘feminist’ groups, or superseded by work on ‘gender’ and that there are ‘gender advisors’ to take care of

¹ *UNSCR 1960 and the need for focus on full implementation of UNSCR 1325*, OPEN LETTER TO MEMBER STATES OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL Re: Res 1960. Global Women’s Peace Network. 7 January 2011.

<http://www.gnwp.org/unscr-1960-and-the-need-for-focus-on-full-implementation-of-unscr-1325>

² UN Women – introductory section on Women, War and Peace

http://www.unifem.org/gender_issues/women_war_peace/

³ There are 27 to date – 12 of which are EU member states. For analysis of NAPs, see IfP and for EU NAPs, EPLO.

'gender mainstreaming', which makes efforts even more difficult.

With increasing international attention to the horror of war rape and sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA), two years ago this pressure led to UNSCR 1820 to further the obligation to act on the second and third pillars of 1325 – prevention and protection. The aim was to bring greater attention to the problem of conflict-related sexual violence (SGBV) as a tactic of warfare and a matter of international peace and security, requiring a peacekeeping, justice, services and peace negotiation response.⁴ This resolution was also ground breaking as it finally designated SGBV as a war crime.

Leading up to the tenth anniversary of 1325, the international community realised it must improve the implementation of 1325 and 1820 and hence the UNSC released two further resolutions – 1888 and 1889. These called on Member States and the UNSG to further commit to implementation and develop tools, reporting mechanisms, responses, services, indicators, monitoring, planning and funding. UNSCR 1889 (2009) complements 1325 as it calls for the establishment of global indicators to measure progress on its implementation. Resolution 1888 (2009) aimed to strengthen UNSCR 1820 by focusing on strengthening leadership, expertise and other institutional capacities within the United Nations and in Member States to help put an end to conflict-related sexual violence (see Table 1).

Six months ago, the notion that strong practical requirements and accountability are needed if 1325 (and 1889) and 1820 (and 1888) are to be successful, was further strengthened with UNSCR 1960. This resolution focused on addressing GBV in conflict, in particular, the language obliged the UNSG to publish lists of perpetrators and for sanctions committees to use this as a “basis for more focused United Nations engagement with those parties, including, as appropriate, measures in accordance with the procedures of the relevant sanctions committees” (operational paragraph 3) hence attempting to act on impunity. It also firmly requires the UNSG to “track and monitor” and develop a strategy for implementing 1820 and 1888. One major critique of this resolution, however, was that women on the ground were not consulted before its passing, with one group stating that “It speaks only of women as victims of sexual abuse during violent conflict and does not mention that if women were recognized as participants in decision making they would be less vulnerable to attack.”⁵

However, as with many instruments, they are always a work in progress. What is important for the EU is that they give a baseline and authoritative background, as well as a standard upon which to also enhance and revise, for example, the *Implementation of UNSCR 1325 as reinforced by UNSCR 1820 in the context of ESDP (doc 15782/3/08)*. For a summary of the resolutions and their innovations, see Table 1.

⁴A good analytical reference to the UNSCRs can be found in Swen Dornig/Nils Goede: *Ten Years of Women Peace and Security. Gaps and Challenges in Implementing Resolution 1325*. Duisburg: Institute for Development and Peace (INEF Policy Brief 7/2010).
http://www.peacewomen.org/assets/file/Resources/Academic/1325_10years_gaps_challenges_dorningangoede_july2010.pdf

⁵ Op. Cit. Global Women's Peace Network. 7 January 2011.

Table 1 : Adapted from UNIFEM 2010/UNW 2011⁶ – summary of UNSC resolutions on WPS following 1325 and 1820. *Summary of operational paragraphs by ISIS Europe. See footnote 7 for weblink to UNSCR full texts with subtitles.*

<p>Strengthening women’s participation (Resolution 1325 (2000) calls for strengthening women’s agency as peacemakers and peacebuilders, including their participation in conflict prevention and peace processes, early recovery, governance and in peace operations. Resolution 1889 (2009) complements 1325 by calling for the establishment of global indicators to measure progress on its implementation.)</p>	<p>Ending sexual violence and impunity (Resolution 1820 (2008) calls for an end to widespread conflict-related sexual violence and for accountability in order to end impunity. Resolution 1888 (2009) focuses on strengthening leadership, expertise and other institutional capacities within the United Nations and in member states to help put an end to conflict-related sexual violence.)</p>	<p>Providing an accountability system</p>
<p>1889 (to strengthen 1325): Addresses women’s exclusion from early recovery and peacebuilding as well as the lack of adequate planning and funding for their needs. Requests the formulation of a strategy to increase numbers of women in conflict-resolution decision-making, and of tools to improve implementation: indicators and proposals for a monitoring mechanism.</p> <p>UNSG must: produce a strategy to increase numbers of female peacemaking and peace keeping decision-makers; ensure all country reports address gender issues; enable UN entities to collect data on women’s post-conflict situation; produce a global set of indicators of implementation of 1325; propose a mechanism for monitoring 1325.</p> <p>UNSC must: add provisions for women’s empowerment to mandate renewals for UN missions.</p> <p>States must: promote women’s participation in political and economic decision-making from the earliest stage of peacebuilding; track money spent on women in post-conflict and recovery planning; invest in women’s physical and economic security, health, education, justice, and participation in politics.</p>	<p>1888 (to strengthen 1820): Strengthens tools for implementing 1820 through assigning high-level leadership, building judicial response expertise, strengthening service provision, and building reporting mechanisms.</p> <p>UNSG must: appoint a Special Representative of the SG (SRSG) on sexual violence in conflict; appoint Women Protection Advisers (WPAs) to UN operations; establish a rapid response team of judicial experts; propose ways the SC can improve monitoring and reporting on conflict related sexual violence; provide details to the SC on parties to armed conflict credibly suspected of perpetrating patterns of rape.</p> <p>UNSC must: raise sexual violence in designation criteria for sanctions committees.</p> <p>States must: improve legal frameworks to prevent impunity; improve support services for sexual violence survivors; ensure traditional leaders prevent stigmatization of victims; support comprehensive strategies to stop sexual violence.</p>	<p>1960 (to strengthen 1888) Mandates the Secretary-General to list those parties credibly suspected of committing or being responsible for patterns of sexual violence in situations on the Council’s agenda. Relevant sanctions committees will be briefed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict, and may take action against listed parties.</p> <p>UNSG must: establish monitoring, analysis and reporting arrangements on sexual violence in conflict.</p> <p>UN must: improve cooperation among UN actors for a system-wide response to sexual violence. Appoint more women protection advisers to peacekeeping missions in accordance with UNSCR 1888.</p>
<p>Summary of operational paragraphs (<i>all parties = all parties to the armed conflict; SV=sexual violence; CAC = children and Armed conflict; UNSG = UN Secretary-General; MS = member states; PKO = peacekeeping operations/missions; GA = gender advisors; GFP = gender focal points; WPA = Women Protection Advisors; GEWE= gender equality and women’s empowerment; GM = gender mainstreaming; PBG = peacebuilding</i>)</p>		
<p>1. MS and international & regional organisations increase women’s participation all stages of peace processes, esp. decision-making level; 2. Encourage parties to respect international law on rights & protection of women & girls;</p>	<p>1. Increase initiatives to address SV in armed conflict; 2. Lobby for cessation by all parties of SV; 3. Increase & improve measures to protect women & children from SV; 4. UNSG to appoint a Special Representative to address</p>	<p><i>In situations of armed conflict:</i> 1. UNSC (where necessary) adopt appropriate steps to address; 2. Complete cessation by all parties of all acts of SV; 3. UNSG annual reports on 1820 & 1888 include detailed list of parties suspected of committing SV;</p>

⁶ http://www.unifem.org/gender_issues/women_war_peace/

<p>3. MS prosecute those responsible for all forms of violence committed against women & girls in armed conflicts;</p> <p>4. UNSG increase women's participation in UN, political, peacebuilding & PKOs;</p> <p>5. UNSG's reports (to UNSC) include impact of armed conflicts on women and girls, their needs & obstacles;</p> <p>6. UN bodies collect data, analyze and assess needs of women & girls post-conflict;</p> <p>7. UNSG include promotion of GEWE post-conflict in UN mission mandates, & appoint GAs and WPAs to PKOs;</p> <p>8. MS ensure GM in post-conflict PBG;</p> <p>9. MS, UN bodies, donors & civil society ensure women's empowerment in post-conflict needs assessments & planning;</p> <p>10. MS consultation with civil society & women's organisations to design concrete strategies (in legal system) for girls' needs & priorities;</p> <p>11. MS, UN bodies & civil society, ensure women & girls' equal access to education post-conflict;</p> <p>12. Parties ensure protection from SV in refugee camps;</p> <p>13. Include needs of women & girls associated with armed forces & groups in DDR planning;</p> <p>14. PBG Commission & PBG Support Office ensure resources for GEWE in post-conflict PBG;</p> <p>15. UNSG improve participation of women in political & economic decision-making;</p> <p>16. UNSG ensure cooperation between SRSG on Children & Armed Conflict and the SRSG on SV;</p> <p>17. UNSG submit indicators on 1325 to the SC in 6 months;</p> <p>18. UNSG include review of progress on 1325; assessment of UNSC analysis, process & action on 1325; recommendations on coordination between actors on 1325; data on women in PKO;</p> <p>19. UNSG report to UNSC in 12 months on women's participation & inclusion in PBG & planning post-conflict – needs analysis; challenges to participation in Conflict Resolution, PBG & GM; support national capacity planning & financing; financial & institutional arrangements for participation.</p>	<p>SV in armed conflicts;</p> <p>5. Encourage all UN system to support the UNSR;</p> <p>6. MS to undertake legal & judicial reforms;</p> <p>7. Cooperation of all parties to combat impunity;</p> <p>8. UNSG to deploy team of experts to address SV & support national legal & judicial officials in addressing impunity;</p> <p>9. Collaboration of MS, UN bodies & civil society in building national capacity in judicial & law enforcement systems;</p> <p>10. Cooperation of PKO & UN missions for information sharing;</p> <p>11. New UNSCR mandates for PKO must contain prevention of & response to SV;</p> <p>12. Identification of WPAs in PKO mandates;</p> <p>13. States to assist victims of SV;</p> <p>14. Consult local women / women's organisations about needs;</p> <p>15. Encourage national and local leaders to sensitize local communities about SV;</p> <p>16. SG to increase no. women in decision-making processes;</p> <p>17. SV included in peace negotiation agendas;</p> <p>18. Peacebuilding Commission promote gender-based approaches to reduce instability post-conflict;</p> <p>19. MS to deploy more female military & police personnel to UN PKOs;</p> <p>20. UNSG adopt specific trainings for military and police personnel on addressing SV;</p> <p>21. UNSG increase no. of awareness trainings for preventative action;</p> <p>22. UNSG adopt specific measures to ensure systematic GM;</p> <p>23. MS & UN bodies develop joint Government-UN strategies to combat SV;</p> <p>24. UNSG ensure systematic reporting on SV;</p> <p>25. MS include in reports measures to protect from SV;</p> <p>26. UNSG include specific proposals for M&R in UN system;</p> <p>27. UNSG annual reports include: 1820 strategy plan for collection of info, updates on efforts by UN GFP on SV; info on parties suspected of committing sexual abuses;</p> <p>28. 2 year review of UNSR (para 4) mandate & team of experts (para 8).</p>	<p>4. UNSG apply listing & de-listing criteria for parties in annual report on SV</p> <p>5. Parties make & implement time-bound commitments to combat SV; specific commitments on timely investigation of alleged abuses;</p> <p>6. UNSG monitor implementation of commitments by parties & update UNSC;</p> <p>7. All UN bodies cooperate & share info on SV;</p> <p>8. UNSG establish monitoring, analysis & reporting on SV & engage actors to enhance data collection and analysis of SV;</p> <p>9. UNSG ensure transparency & coordination between SRSG CAC & SRSG SV;</p> <p>10. Appoint more WPAs to PKOs;</p> <p>11. UNSG prepare scenario-based training materials on SV for PK; MS use in pre-deployment;</p> <p>12. PKOs communicate effectively with local communities;</p> <p>13. PKO mandate include SV; UNSG include gender expertise in technical assessment missions;</p> <p>14. UN bodies support SRSG on SV; coordinate with all stakeholders;</p> <p>15. MS increase no. of female military and police personnel; provide adequate personnel training on SV;</p> <p>16. zero tolerance on SEA for PKO and humanitarian personnel; guidance for military & police personnel on SV in predeployment and induction training; situation-specific procedures on SV;</p> <p>17. SRSG on SV provide briefings on SV;</p> <p>18. UNSG reports on 1820 & 1888 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -information collection coordination and strategy plan; -progress on monitoring & reporting; -list & details on suspect parties engaged in SV; -updates on efforts combatting SV by: GFPs; Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC), UN Country Team, SRSG CAC & SRSG SV; Team of Experts.
--	---	--

Assessment of EU Policy

The EU developed a Comprehensive Approach (CA) for implementing 1325 and 1820 in December 2008⁷, which included a section of specific measures (Chapter E). The Comprehensive Approach is indeed a comprehensive document rather than a new policy, in that it lists all policies to date and highlights best practice examples from CSDP mission Joint Actions and programming actions under the various financial instruments. It has seven categories of specific actions and was a major achievement in obtaining Council and Commission agreement to accept the document.

The main EU actions from 2009 to 2011 in implementing the CA have been consolidating the Taskforce meetings, enhancing Member State and Gender Advisor meetings, encouraging training, developing indicators and providing the first report on the latter. As the CA is only two and a half years old, and the EU has seen major structural and staffing changes under the Lisbon Treaty since December 2009, it is not possible to fully assess the implementation and impact of the CA as yet. However, that EU indicators for 1325/1820 have been developed, disseminated and data already collected (see separate section) is quite an achievement already.

A summary⁸ of the main principles of the CA, which can be assessed *vis-à-vis* CSDP missions in the specific measures, include the following paragraphs (more analysis in the subsequent sub-sections):

Chapter E, paragraph 25: Political support for SCR 1325 and 1820, –

‘The EU considers peace processes as opportunities to promote women’s empowerment, gender equality, gender mainstreaming and respect for women’s rights within resulting peace agreements and in its interventions will seek to ensure that these issues are integrated and prioritised in the subsequent peace building and post conflict reconstruction phase. The EU will seek to support women’s participation in peace processes both through diplomacy and financial support. The EU will strive towards greater number of women as mediators and chief negotiators. Recognising that women’s peace efforts at the local and national levels are also a valuable resource for conflict resolution and peace building, the EU will support these organisations to engage in peace processes in addition to involving women at all formal decision-making levels.’

Chapter E, paragraphs 35, 36: Integration of women, peace and security considerations in sector activity,

‘In its support to Security Sector Reform (SSR), the EU will ensure that the reform processes account for the specific security needs of both women and men, boys and girls, and promote women’s inclusion in the staff of the institutions concerned (such as the police)...In its support to the strengthening and reform of the justice sector the EU will seek to enhance the involvement of women and their access to justice, including transitional justice mechanisms. The EU will pay specific attention to building capacity for the prosecution of crimes against women and the protection of witnesses. The provision of reparations and other forms of redress for survivors will be considered wherever

⁷ *Comprehensive approach to the EU implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820 on women, peace and security*, EU Doc 15671/1/08
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/hr/news187.pdf

⁸ Due to the limited scope of this briefing, a full analysis is not included. More detail can be found in the Report for the EP *Implementation of EU policies following the UN Security Council Resolution 1325*, November 2010. http://www.isis-europe.org/pdf/2010_artrel_593_2010dec-ep-study-1325.pdf

possible. Ending impunity for war crimes affecting women is the objective of these efforts, as is providing justice and redress to victims.'

As many CSDP missions are advisory missions on security sector reform (SSR) in conflict and post-conflict phases, inclusion of gender mainstreaming, as well as gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) in the post-conflict phase is highly important. This is reflected in the operational plans of missions (see separate section on the indicator report). Furthermore, the particular attention to justice reform and inclusion of women is an area still to be worked on – but can be dependent on the capacity and willingness of the host country to a CSDP advisory mission. One difference here is EULEX Kosovo, which has an executive mandate.

Chapter E, paragraph 26: Training,

'Gender issues and UNSCR 1325 awareness in the context of ESDP missions/operations are training requirements in the field of ESDP. The EU will therefore continue to improve its understanding of issues related to women, peace and security through intensified and consolidated training at all levels. Member States will offer relevant training courses to the annual EU training programme to train their nationals and open these courses also for the participation of other nationals. The European Security and Defence College will continue to reflect the gender perspective in all relevant ESDC training activities. It will also consider the production of training material in the context of the developing Internet-Based Advanced Distance Learning (IDL) system making use of existing training material of Member States, the UN, OSCE and other potential contributors.'

Enhancement of Member States in inclusion of gender in pre-deployment training and the standardisation of modules through the ESDC and development of a gender module in 2011 (see separate section) show the positive developments for this measure. However, there is still a need to develop assessment of the understanding of gender by personnel post-training.

Chapter E, paragraph 28, 29, 30 and 31 - Exchange of information and best practices
28,

'The exchange of information between the different actors involved should be encouraged without prejudice to the chain of command. To this end, a 'Women, Peace and Security Task Force' will be convened in Brussels to increase inter-institutional coordination and to promote a coherent approach to gender-related issues. The Task Force will be composed of staff working on both gender equality and security issues across the relevant Council Secretariat and Commission services, and be open to EU Member State participation. It should meet regularly with the EU SG/HR Personal Representative on Human Rights, the CPCC Civilian Operations Commander and other relevant senior officials. The Task Force should regularly consult with civil society organisations.'

29,

'An open exchange among EU Member States on national implementation of Resolution 1325 will be organised once a year in view of sharing best practices and identifying joint interests, taking in particular into account difficulties encountered and the lessons identified for the future....'

30,

'Information sharing and consultation on women, peace and security issues is encouraged between ESDP mission/operation representatives and EC delegations without prejudice to the chain of command.'

31,

'A dedicated Website for women, peace and conflict issues will be set up to facilitate access to information. Without prejudice to the chain of command ESDP gender focal points will have access to the EC network of gender focal points and invited to the meetings and trainings taking place in Brussels.'

Since the CA, the Taskforce has been set-up and been the main driver for implementation, exchange, development and collation of indicators and collection of best practices/information (see section below). Since 2009, CSDP mission Gender Advisors have all met annually in Brussels for an exchange of lessons and best practices and will have a third meeting in June 2011. As introduced in the European Parliament Committee on Foreign Affairs (EP AFET) report in 2009 (see footnote 23), the EU Gender Equality Institute could play a role in enhancing exchange and assist in indicator reporting, however, this avenue is still to be explored.

A further development was an exchange session between civilian Heads of Missions (HoM) in Brussels focused on gender, including discussions of implementation of EU documents on gender and debates on ideas *vis-à-vis* working processes with Gender Advisors in missions. Generally, this meeting was positive and outlined EUTM Somalia, EUPOL Afghanistan and EUSEC/POL DRC as good examples of implementing gender in missions, but there was also acknowledgement of staffing constraints. There are also now indications of high level support in the EAS for analysis and exchange, with a one day EU and Member State meeting with the African Union during summer 2011 to analyse the implementation (and impact?) of 1325 on the two continents. There are also some indications that the HR/VP is considering an EU Special Representative with a portfolio on some aspect of WPS/VAW/gender, which is also strongly supported by UN Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict, Margot Wallström.

While there were strong efforts to improve the webpages on WPS in 2009/2010, internal EU exchange of information and documentation has been hampered by the change-over to the EAS, such that webpages have gone missing while the websites are being refurbished and due to change of staff, two internal newsletters on gender are no longer produced (one in DG AIDCO and one in the former Human Rights Unit of the Council General Secretariat).

The main EU policy tool in the area of gender in CSDP is the revised document 'Implementation of UNSCR 1325 as reinforced by UNSCR 1820 in the context of ESDP',⁹ as for the Comprehensive Approach, it was agreed by the Council in December 2008. The document builds on a previous document and a checklist on the same topic (dating from 2005 and 2006 respectively). The document seeks to ensure implementation of UNSCRs 1325 and 1820 – at both strategic and operational level - from the early planning to the conduct of CSDP missions and operations to identifying lessons. The 1325/1820 CSDP document and the Comprehensive Approach may be considered as the two main components of EU policy on WPS.

Assessment of CSDP missions (gender reports and independent research)

Direct assessment of gender in missions is undertaken through reporting in-mission and mission reports to HQ and Brussels. This follows from the *Implementation of UNSCR 1325 as reinforced by UNSCR 1820 in the context of ESDP 15782/3/08* which states,

'As a general rule, gender related aspects, including information on sexual and gender based violence as well as local women's role as actors should be included in the regular and frequent reports by the EUSRs, HoMs or Commanders, as well as in the reports provided by each component of the mission/operation, to their Chain of Command.'

These reports however are not public, nor is there a standardisation of reporting. As it is not obligatory, it is often left up to the Gender Advisor and the level, inclusion and impact of reporting is often dependent on the strength of a GA's personality, position or support from the HoM.

⁹ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/08/st15/st15782-re03.en08.pdf>

Some missions actively promote action and visibility on gender in their magazines and websites and one mission - EUPM BiH - has conducted a full study on women and police¹⁰ as well as a joint project with the mission, a local NGO and UNIFEM on *Participation of Public in Peace Processes – UNSCR 1325*, which concluded *inter alia* one positive aspect in that, 'progress has been made in the implementation of UNSCR 1325, with remarkable moves in gender sensibilisation by those responsible to respond in the event of violence against women and girls (police, media, civil society), as well as in reform processes in the security sector pertaining to the punishment of violence perpetrators and greater participation of women in peacekeeping, humanitarian and reconstruction processes.'¹¹

However, the report also recommended, "continuous advocacy, financial assistance, technical, legal and political expertise, as well as the understanding of gender equality in international, national and local structures,"¹² as well as a need for increased international attention and funds for women's human rights and gender.

The Council of the EU also published its own recommendations in September 2009, focussing on training in *Implementation of UNSCR 1325 and UNSCR 1820 in the context of training for the ESDP missions and operations - recommendations on the way forward (doc 13899/09)*. There are four main areas for recommendations:

- i) Implementation - improve quality and coherence of training through standardised courses (which has been instigated by the Ministries of Spain and the Netherlands and provided the first ESDC certified course on gender in June 2011); experts and expert organisations should assist in preparing and conducting training; staff should have an understanding of 1325, 1820 and EU policy; contacts with all other actors should exchange best practices and experiences; refresher courses should be taken; and finally, there should be reporting, evaluation of impact, and a collection of specific lessons. Member States should also use NAPs to strengthen member State capacity in pre-deployment training;
- ii) Availability and access – EU Member States seek to ensure availability of training, establish good practice documentation and training activities; CSDP mission staff participation in EC gender training; use of ITC-ILO/UNIFEM online gender course and the ESDC IDL; EU webpages as a source of information, links and training notices.
- iii) Strengthen links between capability, training and deployment – gender mainstreaming in the CRTs and SSR pool; updating of EU documents on training requirements, ESDC training, EU HQ training guide, job profiles, and selection processes.
- iv) Improve awareness of gender mainstreaming as furthering operational effectiveness – strengthen top-down approach to gender training, regular briefing of HoMs and OpCdrs, associate fact-finding mission with the GFP in EU Delegation, gender mainstreaming in the mission handbook.

Some research institutes have analysed gender in CSDP as well as best practices.¹³ In addition to the above recommendations from the EP and other groups, 'CSDP missions should coordinate their action with other EU initiatives and broader international community. The Comprehensive Approach on Resolutions 1325 and 1820 notably calls for a coordinated approach including CSDP missions, political dialogue, development cooperation, multilateral cooperation and humanitarian aid.'¹⁴ In addition, the EU can play a leading role in exposing, reporting, accounting and preventing SEA and GBV (both inside and outside of the mission and amongst local stakeholders) through gender sensitive work of a mission. Along with internal indicators now developed for the EU on 1325 and 1820, some experts feel that the EU can play a strong political role in parallel with missions in host countries through negotiating

¹⁰ http://www.eupm.org/FCKeditor/Images/File/Women_in_Police-Zene_u_policiji.pdf

¹¹ http://www.eupm.org/FCKeditor/Images/File/Final_Report_1325_UNSCR.pdf p14.

¹² Ibid p15

¹³ Notably, EU-ISS, Genderforce, ISIS Europe, CMC, DCAF.

¹⁴ Leinonen, Kati, "Get it Right! Giving the appropriate place to gender and human rights in the Common Security and Defence Policy" in Kirsi Henriksson, Ed. *CMC Finland YEARBOOK 2010 on Peacebuilding and Civilian Crisis Management Studies*, Volume 3: Number 6/2010, CMC Finland. P 89.

“human rights and gender benchmarks” and to not continue to support “institutions that persistently commit human rights violations,”¹⁵ such as those that the CSDP missions may be working with in SSR support.

Some responses from NGOs with experience interacting with CSDP missions indicate that there is still not clear or regular consultation with missions. However, there have been ad-hoc or one-off consultations with NGOs, which indicates that at minimum, CSDP missions are implementing the need to engage with locals that work on, or in the context of, gender perspectives including in the framework of the UNSC resolutions. This is of course contextual, depending on the CSDP mission – and the EUPOL and EUSEC DRC missions are highlighted as often using and implementing aspects of 1325 and 1820 in sensitisation in SSR (both with police/military and civil society), as well as going further in specifics – particularly in advice on justice reform in relation to gender equality in family laws in the DRC. Finally, the first ever recent open days conducted across the CSDP missions in the host countries in 2010 around the context of the anniversary of 1325 were received very positively by local communities.

Analysis of the Taskforce capacity

The informal Taskforce on Women Peace and Security that was set-up in 2009 is the principle driver for implementing 1325, 1820, 1888, 1889, 1960 and the EU Comprehensive Approach. Initially consisting of some 15 gender staff across the Commission and Council General Secretariat and led by the former DG Relex B1, with the EAS changes, the taskforce has dropped to around 10 gender staff (mainly part-time/double-hatted) and is led by the Human Rights Unit in the EAS. This low number can limit EU implementation of WPS – particularly when compared to the number of staff working in EC DG Employment Gender Equality Unit as being 23 in 2010. Despite this challenge, the Taskforce has continued work on developing the first report on the EU indicators and has maintained strong cooperation between the Commission and the EAS, as well as outreach to other actors including the UN, civil society groups, NGOs, researchers and NATO. However, its capacity is severely constrained by lack of human resources and a clear structure for gender in the EAS. For CSDP, there are only 2 staff dedicated to gender (and one also works on human rights), thus without the support of Member States (notably Belgium for the report on indicators), the Taskforce is able to only achieve as much as its capacity allows. To thus further give capacity to its work, they have set-up an expert-level group with the UN to strengthen collaboration in 2011 and beyond, focusing on WPS, VAW and gender policy dialogue.

Analysis of indicators process and positive impact (relevant to CSDP)

The 17 EU indicators developed and published in July 2010 as the Council document *Indicators for the Comprehensive approach to the EU implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820 on women, peace and security (doc 11948/10)*,¹⁶ were sent to EU Member States, EU Special Representatives, CSDP missions and 36 EU Delegations¹⁷ by the Taskforce. The first baseline report was released in May 2011 and discussed in a meeting convened by the informal Task Force, with staff from the EAS, Commission, European Parliament, 11 Member States, UN as well as NGOs, experts and civil society platforms.

As a first positive step, the turn-around of the first *Report on the EU-indicators for the Comprehensive Approach to the EU Implementation of the UN Security Council UNSCRs*

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st11/st11948.en10.pdf>

¹⁷ This grouping was decided on the basis of a non-official list where DAC is used – namely fragile states.

1325 & 1820 on Women, Peace and Security (doc 9990/11),¹⁸ in under a year from the development of the indicators, is a success for the Taskforce itself.

The indicators cover all aspects of the EU's Comprehensive Approach, even though all aspects of WPS are interrelated, this paper is specifically orientated to CSDP, as such, not all the indicators will be covered here. In direct relation to CSDP or CSDP missions and operations (hereafter missions), there are 6 (of 17) indicators explicit to gender and CSDP (abbreviated – full text in footnote¹⁹):

- **indicator 10** on meetings of CSDP missions with women's groups and/or NGOs;
- **indicator 11** on proportion of women and men in CSDP missions;
- **indicator 12** on proportion in CSDP missions that are gender trained;
- **indicator 13** on percentage of CSDP missions with references to WPS in policy/operational documentation and reporting;
- **indicator 14** on number and percentage of gender advisors or focal points in missions; and
- **indicator 15** on number of cases of sexual abuse or exploitation by CSDP staff investigated and acted upon.

Indirectly, four indicators cover CSDP: **indicator 4** on number and type of EU partner coordination in host countries; **indicator 5** on number of projects or programmes in specific sectors – notably SSR, DDR, - that contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment; **indicator 6** on NAPs is relevant to CSDP, but the reporting does not have the level of detail of elements of NAPs that enhance gender in CSDP and **indicator 7** on collaboration with NATO.

Immediate critique of the indicators relates to the data as only providing superficial examination of implementation (namely on numbers/percentages) but without in-depth analysis of impact of CSDP on women on the ground. Some Member States also indicated the requirement for a longer lead-in to enable them time to obtain responses to the indicator questions. However, as was pointed out when the indicators were being developed, this is a work in progress and unprecedented due to little work on gender analysis so far and the indicators can be refined from the results of the baseline analysis.

Specific recommendations for improvement include more detail *vis-à-vis* mission mandates – for example on monitoring for Georgia or on maritime aspects for Somalia or border aspects for Palestine/Ukraine/Moldova missions. Also more qualitative data on the impact of EU efforts, the impact of EU actions on WPS - for example creating space for women's participation and more systematic reporting - and also a more inclusive approach – such as consulting women in conflict-affected countries to assess the impact of 1325 Open Days and involving country-level civil society in development of next steps for the indicators.

Positive aspects of the report include that it finally gives an orientation point for those working on gender in an EU context – something that the EU has actually achieved before the UN.²⁰ Also, this baseline gives a set of indicators that the EU can then use to help those in-country

¹⁸ <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/11/st09/st09990.en11.pdf>

¹⁹ **indicator 10** (Number and type of meetings of EU Delegations, EU Member States' embassies and CSDP missions with women's groups and/or NGOs dealing with women, peace and security issues); **indicator 11** (Proportion of women and men among heads of diplomatic missions, staff participating in UN peacekeeping operations and CSDP mission at all levels, including military and police staff); **indicator 12** (Proportion of men and women trained specifically in gender equality among diplomatic staff, civilian and military staff employed by the EU Member States and military and police staff participating in UN peacekeeping operations and CSDP missions); **indicator 13** (Number and percentage of CSDP missions and operations with mandates and planning documents that include clear references to gender/women, peace and security issues and that actually report on this); **indicator 14** (Number and percentage of CSDP missions and operations with gender advisors or focal points.); **indicator 15** (Number of cases of sexual abuse or exploitation by CSDP staff investigated and acted upon).

²⁰ The UN however has been developing their 1325 Global Indicators over 2 years and is soon to implement them.

to use them in a contextual manner to analyse their particular contexts. Another positive is the fact that many aspects are publically compiled and accessible for the first time with an easy reference point. For example, the first public reporting of SEA by CSDP staff, which could be strengthened with elements of 1888 and 1960. This is 'positive' in that there was previously resistance by staff and Member States to acknowledge this problem and bring it to the open.

Analysis of gender standardisation in CSDP (GAs, documentation, training, lessons)

Of all the areas to implement the UNSCRs with standardisation in documentation, training and lessons/best practice exchange, the EU has made advances over the past few years with documentation, Gender Advisors, increased focus on training and exchanges. However, some of the advances made up until 2010 have stagnated a little with the EU restructuring into the EAS, which has particularly affected the placement of gender staff.

Although every mission apart from EUBAM Rafah has a gender advisor (GA) or a gender focal point (GFP), external analysis (and internal commentary) and recommendations to date on the importance of full-time dedicated GAs has not been fulfilled. Unfortunately for the smaller CSDP missions, most GAs are double hatted, which minimizes their capacity. In larger missions however, gender units have been established (in EULEX Kosovo and EUPOL Afghanistan). From the indicator report, it appears that only 4 of 13 missions (one is the border mission Ukraine/Moldova under the Commission) have at least one full-time single-hatted GA.

Vis-à-vis documentation, the discussions under way for the review of 15782/3/08 include reference to UNSCRs 1888, 1889 and 1960 and these will be included in the revised document, with the review beginning in June 2011 and likely to include some form of public consultation. In the Civilian Military Planning Directorate (CMPD), internal documentation is virtually zero and most rely on the one gender staff member to ensure gender is mainstreamed in all documents, policy and processes. There are also many questions remaining surrounding the on going structuring of the EAS and how gender experts and institutional capacity will eventually be situated/strengthened.

An important advance, that was not publically visible until the release of the indicator report, is that for CSDP missions, even though the Joint Action mandating the mission does not always refer to WPS, the planning documents for all of the 12 missions have a range of gender implementation, from the broad mentioning of gender mainstreaming, to more detailed aspects of gender balance in the OPLAN (EUPM BiH), training of police on combatting sexual violence (EUPOL DRC) and local ownership (EUPOL COPPS) as examples.

The EU has advanced the most for CSDP in the area of training. In 2010, a report for the European Parliament on implementation of 1325 in the EU's external relations²¹ noted that "Generally efforts and training are regular, however there is still a need for common standards, more extensive (both in content and time-frame) elements and high-level compulsory training." This observation still stands, particularly with the low level of gender training for Heads of Missions and there seemed to be a low level of everyone receiving gender training and as written in the indicator report - particularly only 50% of responding States undertake gender training for all military and 60% of responding States undertake gender training for all police going to CSDP missions/UN Peacekeeping operations.²² However In 2011, a standard EU gender module is being produced by the Swedish Folke Bernadotte Academy, for use both by Member States (whose remit is pre-deployment training)

²¹ Gya, Giji *Implementation of EU policies following the UN Security Council Resolution 1325*, November 2010, Directorate-General for External Policies, DROI Sub-Committee. European Parliament. http://www.isis-europe.org/pdf/2010_artrel_593_2010dec-ep-study-1325.pdf

²² Indicator 12

and by the EU and missions for internal training and post-deployment training. This module will include the developments and nuances of UNSCRs 1888, 1889 and 1960.

Conclusions

The above sections outline the work of the EU on 1325 and 1820. Although not explicit, some of these advances by the EU actually relate to UNSCR 1888, 1889, which aim to strengthen of 1325 and 1820. These can be summarized as, for (EU developments in brackets):

1889

- Strengthening women's participation in peacebuilding (mission consultations and exchanges);
- indicators and monitoring (the first EU indicator report and gender reporting in missions);
- provisions for women's empowerment in mandate renewals (EUPOL and EUSEC DRC).

1888

- Building judicial response expertise (EULEX Kosovo and EUJUST LEX Iraq planning documents);
- support comprehensive strategies to stop sexual violence (EUPOL and EUSEC Joint Action plus in planning documents, gender training (or advice on) to local military and police in EUTM Somalia, EUPOL COPPS, EUPOL Afghanistan, EULEX Kosovo).

2) Recommendations on how to incorporate commitments included in the new UNSCRs on women, peace and security in the existing EU framework for implementation of WPS in CSDP

Assessment of recommendations to date to the EU

Many groups and advocates cover recommendations for gender on National Action Plans, development, aid effectiveness, trade, health, poverty etc, but to date in the EU, there are only a few reports on recommendations *vis-à-vis* the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). These recommendations targeted towards gender and security are summarised below.

The European Parliament has been most active with reports and recommendations since 1325 was established.²³ In 2000, the Parliament released a Resolution on Participation of women in peaceful conflict resolution (2000/2025(INI)) based on a report by MEP Maj-Britt Theorin, issued before 1325. The main recommendations actually pre-empt the content of 1325 and 1820, across three areas: *I. The protection of war affected populations; II. International efforts to prevent and solve armed conflicts and III. Community-based participation in the prevention and resolution of armed conflicts.* It specifically called on the Commission and the Member States to 'gender sensitise peace and security related initiatives', including training to staff in-country and headquarters and to have gender expertise in-country. Thus, the EU has a ten year history of clear basic recommendations for gender peace and security (GPS) in CSDP. During these ten years, four more reports²⁴ were followed by resolutions on GPS, the last in 2010 called for explicit improvements in CSDP and overall structures such that it called on the,

'HR/VC to also strengthen the EU Task Force on women, peace and security and hopes that it will peer-review the adoption and implementation of national action plans on UNSC Resolutions 1325 and 1820, conduct systematic gender analyses of Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) missions and monitor and advise EU delegations in conflict-affected countries and regions;'

²³ A full listing of EU documents on gender and security is regularly updated here. See the latest: Gya, Giji, 'Listing of Gender Peace and Security Documents – May 2011'. *ISIS Europe*. www.isis-europe.org

²⁴ (25 Nov 2010) Resolution of the European Parliament on [10th anniversary of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 \(2000\) on Women, Peace and Security](#) (2010/2968)

(Nov 2010) Report [Implementation of EU policies following the UN Security Council Resolution 1325](#)
Directorate-General for External Policies, DROI Committee. Main author: Giji Gya.

(7 May 2009) RESOLUTION of the European Parliament on [gender mainstreaming in EU external relations and peace-building/nation-building](#). (2008/2198(INI)).

(3 April 2009) REPORT of the European Parliament on [gender mainstreaming in EU external relations and peace-building/nation-building](#). (2008/2198(INI)) Committee on Foreign Affairs. Rapporteur: Libor Rouček.

(April 2009) Report [Gender Mainstreaming and Empowerment of Women in EU's External relations Instruments](#). Directorate General for External Policies, Foreign Affairs. Author: Giji Gya. EXPO/B/AFET/2008/67.

(16 Nov 2006) RESOLUTION of the European Parliament on "[Women in International Politics](#)" (2006/2057(INI))

(17 Oct 2006) REPORT of the European Parliament on "[Women in International Politics](#)" (Rep A6-0362/2006 referencing Res 2006/2057(INI)). Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality. Rapporteur: Ana Maria Gomes MEP.

(01 Jun 2006) RESOLUTION of the European Parliament on "[Women in armed conflicts and their role in post-conflict reconstruction](#)" (2005/2215(INI))

(03 May 2006) REPORT of the European Parliament on [the situation of women in armed conflicts and their role in the reconstruction and democratic process in post-conflict countries](#) (Rep A6-0159/2006 referencing Res 2005/2215(INI)). Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality. Rapporteur: Véronique De Keyser MEP.

as well as: referral to 1325 and 1820 in mission mandates increased number of women in missions, with at least one gender advisor and a gender action plan and, 'allocation of specific and significant financial, human and organisational resources for the participation of women and gender mainstreaming in the field of foreign and security policy'.

EU Presidencies and Member States have promoted 1325/1820, in particular over the last decade, the trio presidency of Germany, Portugal and Slovenia (2007-2008) producing a handbook on Mainstreaming gender and human rights into ESDP, the 2009 French EU Presidency focused on SGBV, the 2009 Swedish, 2010 Spanish and 2011 Hungarian EU Presidencies focusing on training for CSDP and the 2010 Belgian EU Presidency on the 1325 anniversary and EU indicators. Of these, the French EU Presidency focused most explicitly on recommendations for CSDP and produced two background reports examining progress in the missions in Kosovo and DRC as case studies. Main recommendations from these reports that could be extrapolated to all missions, highlighted:

- i) for the EU institutions – have a central unit/body for gender (and coordination of such), create an EU policy specific to missions, improve gender awareness of all staff, creating a gender working group, make EU documentation on gender visible and accessible, create indicators and lessons learned databases.
- ii) For CSDP missions – gender analysis in all fact-finding and assessment reporting, 1325 and 1820 to be included in mission Joint Actions (mandate) concept of operations (CONOPS) and operational plans (OPLANS), recruitment to require gender awareness by candidates, regular and standardised gender training (at all levels and including training pre- and post- mission), gender coaching for Head of Mission (HoM), well-resourced gender advisors (with adequate expertise) situated in the office of the HoM (also not for them to be double-hatted), gender focal points across all sectors of a mission, gender budget lines, zero tolerance of SEA, close collaboration and consultation with women's organisations, support to local stakeholders working on gender/SSR etc. through EU financial instruments, regular gender briefing to Council of the EU Committee on Civilian Aspects (CIVCOM) and the Political and Security Committee (PSC) in Brussels. At the end of the French EU Presidency, following these reports and conference, the EU produced the *Comprehensive Approach to 1325 and 1820* (doc 15671/1/08) and *Implementation of UNSCR 1325 as reinforced by UNSCR 1820 in the context of ESDP* (doc 15782/3/08) as well as draft EU indicators for 1325 and 1820.

Even though 1888 and 1889 were passed at the end of 2009, in 2010, the EU Presidencies concentrated support on development and implementation of the EU indicators – particularly under the Belgian EU Presidency. The changes under the Lisbon Treaty mean that Member States no longer have a strong EU Presidency role – which was often a catalyst in driving forward implementation of UNSC resolutions on gender by including them in Presidency agendas and adding extra human resources through Member State representation staff. The catalyst effect was still the case during the 2010 transition Presidencies – Spain and Belgium – but now Member States work in more of a bilateral capacity and some retain close cooperation with the EAS – for example Belgium in following up the indicators and training and Sweden in training, but this is now more on a practical level rather than driving through recommendations and implementation at a higher Council level.

In addition, *NGOs, researchers, platforms and groups*²⁵ have also made recommendations to

²⁵ The recommendations were distilled from: EPLO, *10 Points on 10 Years of Implementation of UNSCR 1325 in Europe*, September 2010
http://www.eplo.org/assets/files/2.%20Activities/Working%20Groups/GPS/CSO_Position_Paper_10_Points_on_10_Years_UNSCR_1325_in_Europe_1008.pdf.
International Alert *Improving EU Responses to Gender and Peacebuilding: Priority Action Areas for the European Commission*, June 2008
Operation 1325, *Actors for Sustainable Peace. Putting UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security into Practice*; October 2010.
http://operation1325.se/sites/default/files/actors_for_sustainable_peace_1_0.pdf:

the EU. Amongst these, over the past two years specifically (or indirectly) related to CSDP include: EU support for peace processes to ensure that women are engaged at the negotiating table, inclusion of women in missions – including in senior positions, if necessary with quotas. Mission mandate drafting should include a gender expert and the mandate should include 1325, also operational plans should include a gender perspective. There should be specific budget lines for gender implementation/mainstreaming. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms should be clearly described in action plans or strategies on women/gender, peace and security with clarity on responsibility with respect to data collection and reporting and specific budget for M&E. Single-hatted competent gender advisors (or units in a larger mission) should be in all missions and operations. A dedicated Brussels focal point should be available for gender advisors in-country. Gender training should be provided for all staff. There should be adequate staff to cover gender work in the EAS, including a dedicated WPS unit/desk. The EU Task Force (on Women Peace and Security) should undertake a systematic gender analysis of CSDP missions and operations. Missions should have adequate public complaint procedures (and reporting in SGBV). Mission evaluations should include detailed reporting on gender, peace and security matters. Regular consultation by missions should be undertaken with civil society organisations and women's groups. As for Member States, many NGOs and women's groups were concentrating on the anniversary of 1325, on NAPs and the development of EU indicators, hence there are no concrete recommendations on 1888, 1889 and 1960 as yet.

Of these recommendations, several have been implemented or efforts have been made. For example, the recent first report on EU indicators on 1325 shows that every current EU mission, except EUBAM Rafah, has a gender advisor/focal point or unit, albeit with some double-hatted or only part-time. However, training, budgets and adequate human and financial resources – particularly in Brussels – still remain lacking. These later two factors inhibit implementation of many of the solid guidelines in 15782/3/08.

A revision of Implementation of UNSCR 1325 as reinforced by UNSCR 1820 in the context of ESDP (15782/3/08) is foreseen. As such, this section provides practical recommendations to move this process forward, and not a list of every single thing that needs to be improved. Part of the difficulty however is Member State will, a loss of staff under the EAS and the overall strategy behind CSDP. As it is Member States that generate personnel, undertake pre-deployment training, decide and approve CSDP missions, as well as the corresponding concepts, mandates and operational plans, criteria that PSC decision-makers consider rarely relate to the potential impact of the mission on the country in question.²⁶ More it is about what the CSDP mission can do for the EU's CFSP, thus it is an on going battle to make Member States valorise gender in CSDP, particularly as it affects women on the ground. As such, recommendations take this reality into account. The below recommendations also build on recommendations that already exist and thus concentrate on the few important catalysts that will help drive implementation forward.

Recommendations for EAS and CMPD

The EU has strong documentation, has developed **indicators which it will refine** and has good cooperation and best practice exchange between gender staff and with Gender Advisors in the field. The main aspect lacking for the EU is **staff resources in Brussels**. Many reports

Operation 1325 with the collaboration of the Folke Bernadotte Academy, *Does EU believe that only men can establish long-lasting peace? How EU divides and involves women and men in their peacekeeping operations in the European strategy for safety ESDP*, 2009

http://operation1325.se/sites/default/files/rapport_konsfordelningeu_eng2.pdf

Operation 1325, *Report on the Security Sector Reform*, November 2009,

http://operation1325.se/sites/default/files/ssr-rapport-low_2.pdf

²⁶ Gourlay, Catriona, "The politics of EU civilian interventions", in *Communicate, Coordinate, Cooperate: The A-Z of Cohering Crisis Management in the Post-Lisbon Era*, ISIS Europe and DCAF, forthcoming July 2011.

and recommendations have constantly pointed to the challenge and the EAS has yet to live up to improving this situation. There is not necessarily a need for new overarching policies, nor more guidelines – apart from updating with advances such as UNSCRs - but for staff and financial resources to further implement the EU documents and continue monitoring and evaluation with the indicators.

Two immediate solutions to this challenge would be to **further coordination with the Gender Equality Institute** so that they can provide human resource support to the Brussels staff and also to outsource, cooperate and coordinate closely with or use expertise from other organizations such as UNW/DPKO/OSCE/NATO (with which the Taskforce is already in discussion for collaboration).

The **appointment of an EUSR** could be a possible reinforcing factor, but would need to be done strategically and carefully so that it does not lead to non-reinforcement – i.e. away from gender mainstreaming efforts. An EUSR could also be a possibility to increase **pressure on Member States to implement 1960**, but only if linked well to current mechanisms and staff and mission cooperation with Member States, so as not to undermine all the advances by the few dedicated EU staff already.

The **Taskforce liaises well with stakeholders in Brussels** and their local links to NGOs, civil society, and it should continue to do so, particularly regarding judicial response and reporting mechanisms. **Better website support** for dissemination of information/events/updates (which did previously exist) would assist this.

Recommendations for CSDP missions

Good advances have been made, particularly through the hard work and enthusiasm of GAs. The **support to GAs and budget lines for their work should be increased and improved**, as well as **removing double-hatting** and ensuring that **GAs are placed close to the HoM**.

It would help to **formalise contact and engagement with women on ground** as part of the Polad's role in conjunction with expertise of the GA.

The recommendation of WPAs (as per 1888) is unlikely to garner support at this point as the EU has only just achieved placement of GAs in missions. However, **strengthening the GA's role and position** could assist in this.

Advice by SSR missions on gender mainstreaming requires "top-down" approach, i.e. political support of decision and policy. The CMPD should pursue Lisbon Treaty changes and **strengthen cooperation with Heads of EU Delegations** to cohere political dialogue with CSDP mission implementation in the host country.

Even though SEA and GBV are now taken more seriously by missions, to implement 1960, missions could **strengthen and standardise monitoring and reporting arrangements on sexual violence in conflict**. Confusion over internal versus external aspects of SEA and GBV need to be clarified and **responsibility for monitoring, reporting and accountability** needs to be clarified (GA, HRA or HoM) and clear contextual **regular monitoring mechanisms** per mission developed.

Recommendations for EU Member States

Member States can better support EU advances on implementing gender in CSDP by **pledging GAs** and also **working with (or developing) their NAPs to enhance gender training and gender balance** in recruitment for CSDP missions.

Member States must put efforts into **disseminating and using the standard gender module** once it is developed this year.

Member States should **include the EU and UN indicators in NAPs or other instruments** and oblige themselves to **reporting to EU requests** for responses to indicators.

Joint Actions of missions must also include concrete practical implementation of the UNSCRs (in addition to the planning documents) so that this is visible to the public, recipients and host countries.

Member States – particularly if serving on the UNSC as an elected member - must continue to **support and strengthen UN sanctions and international judicial mechanisms to address impunity.**