Civil Society Dialogue Network

Meeting Report

Expert Policy Workshop:
Refreshing Indicators for the EU's Women, Peace and Security Policy

Brussels, 21 January 2015

Introduction

This document is a non-exhaustive report of the discussions that took place in the framework of a Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) expert policy workshop in Brussels on 21 January 2015. The CSDN is a mechanism for dialogue between civil society and EU policy-makers on issues related to peace and conflict. It is co-financed by the European Union (Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace), and managed by the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO), a civil society network, in co-operation with the European Commission (EC) and the European External Action Service (EEAS). The second phase of the CSDN will last from 2014 to 2016. For more information, please visit the EPLO website.

The aim of the meeting was to reflect on the European Union's monitoring system and gather expert input into the refreshment of the 17 EU Women, Peace and Security Policy Indicators. The meeting brought together over 40 experts from the EU and Member States, international organisations, civil society and academia representatives in plenary and working group sessions to:

- Assess whether the current set of indicators is able to track progress in the implementation of the EU's Comprehensive Approach to UNSCR 1325 and 1820 in a meaningful way;
- Gather lessons from the development and use of indicators from other international organisations, member states and civil society actors; and
- Develop concrete suggestions for the refreshment of some of the existing indicators.

The input provided during this meeting will constitute the starting point for the revision of the EU indicators by the EU informal Task Force on Women, Peace and Security. The refreshed indicators will be submitted for approval to the relevant EU Council Working groups and then to the EU Political and Security Committee (PSC). The next implementation report, due in autumn 2015, will be based on the revised set of indicators.

Irina Bratosin D'Almeida, Research Associate at the Vrije Universiteit Brussels, compiled the report summarizing the discussion and the key recommendations made by participants during the meeting. The opinions and recommendations expressed in the report do not represent the position of the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) or its members, of the EU or Member States.

Background

The European Union (EU) is a strong supporter of the Women, Peace and Security agenda set in UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (UN SCR 1325) and subsequent resolutions. It is one of the most active regional organisations promoting and championing the role of women in the prevention, transformation and resolution of conflicts through its diplomatic missions, engagement in multi-lateral fora, political dialogues, actions in support of women's participation to mediation and negotiation processes, support to women's local peace initiatives and so forth.

The 2008 Comprehensive Approach to the EU Implementation of the UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 & 1820[1] guides EU's work in this area. In 2010, the EU informal Task Force on Women, Peace and Security (Task Force) developed 17 Indicators[2], tailored on the Global Indicators, to monitor progress in implementation. The first two monitoring reports published by the EU (2011, 2014) offer an overview of the efforts undertaken by the EU delegations, Common Security and Defence Policy missions (CSDP), EU Special Representatives (EUSRs) and by individual Member States in the framework of the EU's Comprehensive Approach.

This meeting builds on a previous Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) meeting held on 27 June 2013 organized by EPLO and the EU to feed expert input into the second draft monitoring report. Among the key recommendations emerging from the meeting was to sharpen and refresh the current set of EU indicators to make them more user-friendly and able to capture progress (as well as challenges) in the implementation of the resolution.[3]

The Task Force's decision to refresh the indicators takes place at an opportune moment in time in view of the upcoming 15th anniversary of UNSCR 1325 in October 2015, the 20th anniversary of the Beijing Platform for Action on equality, development and peace; the UN High-level Review to assess progress at global, regional and national level informed by the UN Global Study on UNSCR 1325.

---

[1] EU Comprehensive Approach to UNSCR 1325 and 1820 (2008)
[2] Indicators for the Comprehensive Approach to the EU Implementation of UNSCRs 1325 and 1820 on women, peace and security (2010)
[3] Flash Report on Expert-level CSDN Workshop on Monitoring the Implementation of the EU Comprehensive Approach to UNSCR 1325 and 1820

"Good monitoring and evaluation tells a story of change"
M&E Expert

Good Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems are not just accountability measures but can have a number of clearly defined objectives including to 1) track progress in the implementation of policies; 2) identify existing gaps and challenges in implementation; 3) gather evidence of the effectiveness of the actions / projects implemented; 4) feed back into the policy cycle to inform policy and programming 5) constitute a learning tool for the actors involved. Lessons shared by M&E experts during the discussion pointed at the need to ensure **clarity** in the purpose of the monitoring framework, to design **measurable** indicators, to make sure they are **user-friendly** and to use data collected in a **more strategic fashion** to inform policy and programming.

While there is a strong emphasis in current M&E frameworks at national, regional and global level on tracking numbers, percentages and ratios, participants felt that **more qualitative indicators** should **complement quantitative data**. The data collected can then be enriched by anecdotal evidence and short narratives that can help bring data to life.

A recurring theme was the need to **gather evidence of change (through more qualitative indicators)** in the lives of women and girls. While some M&E frameworks, like the one designed for the Irish National Action Plan (NAP) on UNSCR 1325, are moving towards more **impact-oriented objectives**, the inclusion of impact indicators in global, regional and national frameworks remains limited. For example evaluation of impact remains elusive in relation to trainings on gender and / or women, peace and security. While most monitoring frameworks account for the number of trainings provided and of staff trained, there is currently no data collected either at national or regional level on whether the trainings lead to greater understanding and integration of WPS issues into the work of staff trained.

How M&E contributes to better policy and programming

1) **Inclusion of WPS provisions in peace agreements**
   In 2010 only 36% of peace processes in which the UN was engaged benefited from gender specific expertise which seemed to correlate to low levels of inclusion of Women, Peace and Security issues in the actual peace agreement text. Based on this information UN Women enhanced the deployment of gender experts to all peace processes where the UN was actively involved. This led to a greater inclusion of Women, Peace and Security provisions in the text of the peace agreements.

2) **Addressing maternal mortality rates in conflict-countries**
   Data gathered in conflict-affected countries pointed at a high rate of maternal mortality (double the ratio of non-conflict countries) however skilled health personnel did not attend 37% of births. As a result of this information UN Women developed a financial strategy to provide for training of skilled health professionals and obstetrical facilities in conflict areas.

3) **Negotiating women's access to water**
   The advocacy efforts of one gender advisor in the Irish Defence Forces led to the development of a gender report pro forma to capture sex-desegregated data that was later on integrated into standard reporting mechanisms and into the daily patrol reports of peacekeepers. The Irish Defence Forces use sex-desegregated into daily patrol reports of peacekeepers. In an agricultural patrol area where peacekeepers were deployed, 95% of the agricultural workers were Muslim women and the all-male peacekeepers patrol units could not communicate with them. Women peacekeepers were therefore deployed in patrols and through their contact with the local population they were able to identify a problem regarding access to water. As a result, the army was able to negotiate access to water for the agricultural workers.

At national level, the Irish M&E framework of the National Action Plan (NAP) on Women, Peace and Security constitutes a good model for multiple reasons: 1) it features a Monitoring Group with an Independent Chair 2) the monitoring was undertaken by independent consultants; 3) the framework is very comprehensive and clearly links actions to implementing bodies, agreed timelines, impact and output objectives; 4) the reports are publicly available. While the **thorough and comprehensive** nature of the monitoring framework constitutes a strength, it also represents a challenge. The vast array of indicators (73 indicators distributed over 5 pillars) makes the exercise complex and resource-intense. Yet, the Irish experience shows how the monitoring processes can be used as a **learning opportunity** for all the actors involved in the implementation by highlighting and addressing outstanding weaknesses in the framework and process design.

If process design is key to the success of a monitoring exercise, clear and sound indicators are a pre-condition for it. The **technical nature** of M&E work makes it imperative to involve **statisticians and international monitoring specialists** to ensure that indicators are measurable, use internationally agreed definitions, refer to existing data sources and are comparable across countries / institutions. To complement monitoring frameworks, methodological guidance notes can be useful to guide contributors to report in a consistent fashion. The buy-in and support from senior-management level is also key to ensure that reporting officers feel compelled to collect and report the data.

Consistency among and **inter-linkages** between existing indicators on women, peace and security and other monitoring frameworks (Sustainable Development Goals, New Deal and Peacebuilding and Statebuilding indicators) currently being discussed or already adopted at global and regional level should be promoted. The discussion focused in particular on the current debate on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which will include a **Goal on Peaceful Societies and Capable and Strong Institutions.** A dedicated working group of statisticians is developing the methodological guidelines to effectively measure governance, peace and security issues, which will develop into internationally agreed guidelines. Although there are no specific targets on Women, Peace and Security included in the SDGs, suggestions to include specific indicators on this issue are being put forward by UN Women.

Based on the discussions during the session some key recommendations emerged that could inform the process of refreshing the indicators:

Key lessons on designing effective monitoring mechanisms:
- Translate the aspirational language of policy commitments into concrete, sharp, measurable indicators and involve expert statisticians to this end
- Develop a set of methodological guidelines to inform respondents on the purpose of the reporting exercise, the data sought, the available data sources and clarify any terms that lend themselves to interpretation
- Use to the extent possible internationally agreed definitions
- Make sure the data intended for collection exists or can be produced
- Ensure financial, technical and human resources are made available and that staff trained in M&E is in charge
- Set-up regional coordination mechanisms to exchange data and coordinate monitoring frameworks

Section II
EU Monitoring system and EU Indicators – well begun is half done

The EU monitoring system is multi-layered as it aims to monitor the implementation of UNSCR 1325 by EU Institutions (the EEAS, including EUSRs, CSDP missions and operations and EU Delegations) and the 28 Member States. The multi-faceted nature of the WPS agenda adds to the complexity of the **EU multi-layered monitoring system**. Experience from the two reporting cycles should provide a good starting point for the revision. Both iterations of the EU monitoring report speak to the achievements as well as challenges encountered in the process of collecting

and analysing the data, ensuring consistent reporting over time and producing evidence that can be used in future policy-making.

Key progress observed in the two implementation cycles:

- Increase in the number of EU Member States that have already developed National Action Plans (NAPs)
- New regional level dialogues with focus on women, peace and security and gender issues were developed
- Gender contact points nominated in each EU Delegation
- Better understanding of how the EU supports peace processes and how to improve it, including a lessons learnt study conducted for the EU Mediation Support Team in 2012
- Inclusion of gender in the planning documents of every CSDP mission and operation, and more active monitoring and/or reporting on this topic
- More CSDP personnel is being trained on women, peace and security issues
- More women were appointed as Heads of Delegation (from 11 in 2009 to 24 in 2013 representing 18% of the total 133 Heads of Delegations).

Key challenges identified and way forward

The 17 Indicators developed by the EU Informal Task Force on Women, Peace and Security focus on **measuring the activities and initiatives** taken by EU Institutions (through various instruments and policies) and Member States to fulfil their commitments set out in the EU Comprehensive Approach to UNSCR 1325 and 1820. The indicators were designed on the basis of the global UN indicators to, among others, strengthen accountability in implementation, detect progress, achievements, gaps and weaknesses in the implementation of the policy and facilitate policy formulation as well as possible benchmarking. However, unlike the UN Strategic Result Framework on Women, Peace and Security they do not measure progress against specific goals and they are not linked to short-term and medium-term targets.

If the aim of the EU monitoring framework is to track progress in the implementation of the CA to UNSCR 1325 over time, then it should be complemented by **specific targets / objectives for the EU**. In addition to making the EU's commitment to the agenda more stringent and measurable, this would allow the framework to be designed to 1) measure the **value added** of the EU in achieving a particular goal; 2) **better target resources** where the strategic interests of the EU lie. To this end the EU can also draw on the wealth of good practices and lessons identified from the evaluations of the implementation of NAPs in EU Member States.

In addition, even where actions can be easily tracked and data is available, the current EU framework does not lend itself **to measuring change and impact**. While quantitative and qualitative data on activities, funding and projects on Women, Peace and Security are important to track, the EU could now move one step forward. The existing monitoring framework can be complemented in the short-term by sub-indicators that could capture good practices and lessons identified and demonstrate outcomes and qualitative results; and in the medium-term by **impact assessments** and **in-depth case studies** that can be piloted in a selected number of countries (for example where the EU is actively engaged in supporting a peace process) to measure specifically what change the EU actions triggered.

Among the key challenges identified for both the EU and the UN systems, was the **combination of multiple levels of reporting** in one single framework. In particular, (1) indicators can be interpreted differently by different reporting actors; (2) data can be difficult to compare across different institutions; (3) some indicators may not be relevant for some of the reporting entities. Nonetheless, a general agreement emerged that there are strategic interests for the EU to continue to involve Member States in reporting not least because: (1) it enhances Member States buy-in into the overall process; (2) many national frameworks already include EU-level indicators; (3) in the long term, it might determine other member states to report more regularly.

Finally, the decreasing number and sometimes uneven quality of contributions were considered a worrying trend in the EU reporting mechanism. A strong emphasis was put on the need for **EU delegations** to be more actively engaged into the process as the core providers of quantitative and qualitative field data to feed into the monitoring exercise. Similarly, the Member States are also expected to maintain a sustained level of contributions (the last report saw a drop in **Member States contributions** from 24 to 16), since a different sample of responses makes the reports difficult to compare against each other. Two suggestions to address the drop in contributions were put forward 1) to ensure the questionnaires are sent by the top management 2) to develop a methodological guidance and explanatory booklet for users.

Recommendations for the strategic level:
- Define EU's strategic objectives and targets (short-term and long-term) in the implementation of the Women, Peace and Security agenda within the broader international context
- Link the strategic objectives to actions, timelines and deliverables
- Ensure EU policy framework is in line with recent and current international policy developments on Women, Peace and Security (Global Review etc.)
- Ensure the revision of the Indicators takes into account the ongoing review of the EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development
- Ensure senior management buy-in from the EEAS headquarters as well as from the Heads of Delegations and Heads of CSDP missions.

Recommendations for the operational level:
- Tie adequate human and financial resources to the monitoring framework
- Explore the development of an online shared platform for the indicators where reporting actors can update the reporting information regularly and have access to the data
- Complement the regular reporting exercise with impact assessments and other qualitative research methods to evaluate the impact of EU actions and funding

Recommendations for the technical revision of the existing indicators:
- Revise the indicators in in a way that ensures continuity of reporting and comparability of results
- Develop a methodological guidance and explanatory booklet to guide contributions, clarify terms and provide definitions
- Structure the monitoring framework around the 4 pillars of UN SCR 1325 (prevention, protection, participation and relief and recovery)
- Prioritise qualitative indicators/sub-indicators over quantitative indicators
- Consider adding sub-indicators to the extent possible to ensure continuity and adaptability to changes.
- Ensure training on M&E is provided to reporting officers in EU Delegations, CSDP missions, EUSRs teams
- Revise the indicators to be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART). Consider involving Eurostat expert statisticians into the process.

Section III
The EU Indicators, proposals for refreshment

The recommendations provided below are drawn from the working group discussions the aim of which was to refresh the indicators without embarking on a complete overhaul of the current framework so as to ensure continuity and comparability of data. The objective of the discussions was to provide concrete suggestions on: (1) whether and how to rephrase which indicators; (2) which indicators could be added in light of current policy debates / areas not covered by current indicators (in particular monitoring of SGBV in conflict) (3) what other tools, summaries or products could be produced to support the monitoring and reporting process (please refer to the section above for additional tools to be developed such as a methodological booklet or the M&E framework).

Some indicators were not considered for refreshment, as they were deemed unproblematic, this includes indictors 6, 16 and 17.

International diplomacy and cooperation

Participants in working group one focused on indicators No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 which relate to four key target areas of the EU Comprehensive Approach to UNSCR 1325: (1) support to local, national and regional ownership and implementation of UNSCR 1325 and consultation and cooperation with local stakeholders; (2) provision of political support for UNSCR 1325 and 1820 through the use of EU's political and human rights dialogues with partner countries; (3) inclusion of Women, Peace and Security issues in regional dialogues; (4) cooperation with the UN and other international actors. The discussions in the group focused on ways to bring into the monitoring framework more quantitative data and how the data provided by the various actors, including by the Member States, can be better utilized to avoid duplication.

Indicator 1 – Number of partner countries with whom the EU is engaged in supporting actions on furthering the women, peace and security and / or the development and implementation of national action plans or other national policies to implement the UNSC resolutions on women, peace and security

- Consider clarifying the language. There is currently discrepancy in reporting between Member States that report on all activities developed under UNSCR 1325 and Member States that report only on activities in support of the development of NAPs.

Indicator 2 – Modalities and EU tools including financial instruments that the EU has used to support women, peace and security in its partner countries

- Revise this indicator to make it measurable
- Consider adding a focus/sub-indicator on impact (how do EU tools make a significant contribution?)
- Consider adopting the same language as indicator 1

Indicators 3 – Number of regional level dialogues that include specific attention to women, peace and security in outcome documents, conclusions and targets

- Consider adding examples of good practices.

Indicator 4 – Number of EU partner countries in which work on women, peace and security is coordinated between EU partners and / or with other donors, and type of coordination

- Consider adding examples of good practices

Women's representations and participation in mediation and peacebuilding

Participants in working group two discussed indicators No. 8, 9, 10 and 11 which focus on EU's efforts to support women's participation in peace processes and gender balance in EU top positions related to peace and security. The discussion aimed to provide suggestions on 1) how the EU Indicators could reflect the breadth of EU mediation support activities; 2) how capture how *effective* the EU is in supporting women's involvement in peace processes (as opposed to how *active*) and 3) how to capture progress in women's appointments to key positions in the EEAS.

Participants stressed the need to move beyond measuring the number of women participating in peace processes by, for example, commissioning in-depth case studies to gather additional

information on, for instance: 1) the extent to which the process was actually inclusive, 2) who the women involved in the peace process are (status, age, organisation); 3) the type of issues raised by women and how these issues were addressed or resolved in negotiations; 4) the extent to which women's groups were consulted formally or informally.

Indicator 8 – Number and percentage of women mediators and negotiators and women civil society groups in formal and informal peace negotiations supported by the EU

It could be rephrased as *Number and percentage of women mediators, negotiators, technical experts, and civil society representatives in track 1, 2, and 3 peace processes led by the EU or where the EU takes an active role*

The indicator 8 broken-down into sub-indicators could read:
Number and percentage of women, in peace processes led by the EU or where the EU takes an active role, that act as:
- *Mediators, negotiators, and technical experts in track 1 peace processes;*
- *Representatives of civil society, including women's oganisations, participating in track 1 peace processes;*
- *Mediators, negotiators, and technical experts in track 2 peace processes;*
- *Representatives of civil society, including women's oganisations, participating in track 2 peace processes;*
- *Mediators, negotiators, and technical experts in track 3 peace processes;*
- *Representatives of civil society, including women's oganisations, participating in track 3 peace processes.*

❖ **Useful guidance to be provided:** explain what 'peace processes where the EU takes an active role' mean. This could include processes where the EU lends political, financial and / or technical support.

Proposed New Indicator: *to what extent was gender perspective incorporated in the process design and outcome document of these peace processes?*

Alternatively*: percentage of peace agreement with specific provisions to improve the security and status of women and girls (UN Indicator)*

Indicator 9 – EU activities in support of women's participation in peace negotiations

This indicator is unmeasurable. It could be rephrased as: *Number of peace processes in which the EU is providing specific support for women's meaningful participation.*

Proposed sub-indicator: *Illustrative examples of EU activities in support of women's meaningful participation in peace processes*

❖ **Useful guidance to be provided:** explain what meaningful participation means and what it entails

---

Indicator 10 - Number and type of meetings of EU Delegations EU Member States' Embassies and CSDP missions with women's groups and / or non-governmental organisations dealing with women, peace and security issues

It could be rephrased as: *Number and type of specific actions taken by the EU to address issues raised by women in civil society, including women's organizations, on peace and* security.

Proposed sub-indicator: *Provide examples of how EU delegations, EU member states, embassies, CSDP missions and headquarters personnel have taken up and acted upon issues raised by women in civil society related to the Women, Peace and Security agenda.*

Indicator 11 – Proportion of women and men among heads of diplomatic missions and EC delegations, staff participating in UN peacekeeping operations and CSDP mission at all levels, including military and police staff

It could be rephrased as: *Proportion of women in all EU top positions, including EEAS headquarters, EU Delegations, CSDP missions and operations, among EUSRs teams, staff participating in UN peacekeeping operations.*

Consider including management level at national Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Ministries of Defence.

Crisis management

Participants in working group three discussed indicators No. 12, 13, 14, 15 and 11 which focus on EU's Common Security and Defence Policy missions (CSDP missions). The discussions focused on possible ways in which the indicators can be revised to continue to be relevant as well as capture progress in the implementation of the Women, Peace and Security agenda. Concrete proposals for the indicators discussed are presented below.

Indicator 12 – Proportion of men and women trained specifically in gender equality among diplomatic staff, civilian and military staff employed by the Member States and Community Institutions and military and police staff participating in UN peacekeeping operations and CSDP missions

It could be rephrased as: *Number and percentage of personnel (gender disaggregated data) trained in gender issues in: (1) EUSR's teams; (2) CSDP missions and operations; (3) EU delegations.*

Suggestions for possible sub-indicators: *Indicate the time allocated to the gender training overall and as a fraction of the total training provided.*

Further suggestions:

- ❖ Develop a scorecard that lists all the minimum concepts, from an EU perspective, that any gender training should include
- ❖ Evaluate trainings effectiveness and results
- ❖ Provide good practices and lessons identified regarding the results/ the impact of the trainings provided

---

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

The indicator was deemed to provide no additional information as the new Crisis Management procedures already request gender to be included in the mandates and planning documents of all missions and operations.

This indicator could try to capture additional information regarding:
- ❖ How commitments on gender / women peace and security are actually followed through and implemented by the missions

> ❖ How gender mainstreaming is taken forward in mission strategic documents / reports / Strategic Reviews

Indicator 14 – **Number and percentage of CSDP missions and operations with Gender Advisers or focal points**

Suggestions for possible sub-indicators:
- Whether gender advisors are single or double-hatted
- Where gender advisers are positioned within the team
- To whom gender advisers report
- Present good practices and lessons identified.

- ❖ **Additional suggestion:** develop a standard minimum job description for all Gender Advisors, similar to how NATO has developed guidelines on the profile of gender advisors and their possible tasks and responsibilities.

Indicator 15 – Number of cases of sexual abuse or exploitation by CSDP staff investigated or acted upon

Proposed sub-indicator: *How many people have received training on the Code of Conduct and disciplinary issues?*

Sexual abuse or exploitation by CSDP staff is to be seriously taken into consideration and addressed. Some participants viewed it as a behavioural issue and suggested that, although it can remain part of this set of indicators, it should be properly integrated into the Code of Conduct of Missions and Operations and followed through**.**
To this end the EU should:
- put in place a clear reporting mechanism, for both internal and external complaints
- establish an oversight body at headquarters to ensure complaints and dealt with timely and in a satisfactory way
- ensure all case documentation is available to the oversight body

Prevention and protection (including SGBV in conflict)

UN SCR 1325 and other subsequent UN resolutions speak about the need to protect women and girls from gender-based violence. In the current EU reporting framework no indicators tackle issues related to the prevention of Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) or relief and recovery. Participants in this fourth working group discussed best practices in the development of monitoring frameworks and indicators to measure SGBV in conflict settings and lessons identified from other international organisations.

In the development of any new indicators on the prevention of SGBV in conflict the EU should:

- Ensure indicators draw from existing indicators at UN and national level. The UN has 9 indicators on the prevention of violence against women and girls in conflict and post-conflict situations the EU could draw from.
- Balance out indicators on protection / prevention from SGBV with indicators on women's participation to peace and security decision-making
- Make clear 'what' the EU wants to measure on SGBV:
    - Process-oriented indicators could measure EU activities / funding allocated to prevent SGBV in conflict (no. of staff trained, no. of resources allocated)
    - Outcome-oriented indicators could measure the outcome of those activities
- This data could be complemented by perception indicators on the security and safety of women and girls

Selected further reading resources

Council of the European Union, *Comprehensive approach to the EU implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820 on women, peace and security* (December 2008). Available at : http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/08/st15/st15671-re01.en08.pdf

Council of the European Union, *Implementation of UNSCR 1325 as reinforced by 1820 in the context of ESDP* (December 2008). Available at : http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/08/st15/st15782-re03.en08.pdf

Council of the European Union, *Indicators for the Comprehensive Comprehensive approach to the EU implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820 on women, peace and security* (July 2010). Available at http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/10/st11/st11948.en10.pdf

Council of the European Union, *First report on the EU-indicators for the Comprehensive Approach to the EU Implementation of the UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 & 1820 on women, peace and security* (May 2011). Available at : http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/11/st09/st09990.en11.pdf

Council of the European Union, *Second Report on the EU-indicators for the Comprehensive Approach to the EU Implementation of the UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 & 1820 on Women, Peace and Security* (January 2014). Available at : http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&t=PDF&gc=true&sc=false&f=ST%206219%202014%20INIT

EPLO webpage on gender, peace and security: http://www.eplo.org/gender-peace-and-security

Ireland's National Action Plan for Implementation of UNSCR 1325, 2011 – 2014. Available at : https://www.dfa.ie/media/dfa/alldfawebsitemedia/ourrolesandpolicies/int-priorities/National-Action-Plan-UNSCR-1325.pdf

Karen McMinn and Bronagh Hinds, *Mid-Term Progress Report. Implementation of Ireland's National Action Plan for UNSCR 1325, 2011 – 2014 (2014)*. Available at : https://www.dfa.ie/media/dfa/alldfawebsitemedia/ourrolesandpolicies/int-priorities/Progress-Report-UNSCR-1325.pdf

Karen McMinn, Final Review of Ireland's National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security (2011 – 2014) available at https://www.dfa.ie/media/dfa/alldfawebsitemedia/ourrolesandpolicies/ourwork/empoweringwomen-peaceandsecurity/Final-Evaluation-of-Irelands-First-National-Action-Plan.pdf

Louise Olsson, Martin Åhlin, Marielle Sundin, Anna Lidström, *Gender, Peace and Security in the European Union's Field Missions,* Folke Bernadotte Academy. Avaliable at: https://fba.se/sv/Publikationer/Gender-Peace-and-Security-in-the-European-Unions-Field-Missions/

Martin Åhlin and Louise Olsson, *Field Assesment; Implementing EU Gender Policy in EUMM Georgia*, Folke Bernadotte Academy. Available at: https://www.fba.se/PageFiles/26951/EUMM.pdf

Louise Olsson, Marielle Sundin, *Field Assessment: Implementing EU Gender Policy in EUPOL COPPS,* Folke Bernadotte Academy. Available at: www.fba.se/PageFiles/26951/EUPOL%20COPPS.pdf