EPLO
EUROPEAN PEACEBUILDING LIAISON OFFICE

CIVIL SOCIETY DIALOGUE NETWORK

Towards a Renewed EU Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security: Recommendations from Peacebuilding Civil Society

CSDN Meeting Communication

European Peacebuilding Liaison Office

September 2026

European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO)

The European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO) is the largest independent civil society platform of European NGOs, NGO networks and think tanks that are committed to peacebuilding and the prevention of violent conflict. EPLO's mission is to influence European policymakers to take a more active role in securing peace and resolving and preventing conflict through nonviolent means in all regions of the world, and to do so more effectively.

Civil Society Dialogue Network

The Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) is a mechanism for dialogue between civil society and EU policymakers on issues related to peace and conflict. It is co-financed by the European Union (Neighbourhood Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe). It is managed by the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO), a civil society network, in cooperation with the European Commission (EC) and the European External Action Service (EEAS). The fifth phase of the CSDN will last from 2023 to 2026. For more information, please visit the EPLO website.

EPLO
EUROPEAN PEACEBUILDING LIAISON OFFICE

This document was produced with the financial assistance of the EU. The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of EPLO and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the EU.

The views expressed in this paper are of the authors and do not necessarily represent the policy or opinion of EPLO or of EPLO's member organisations.

© EPLO 2026

Permission is granted for reproduction and use of the materials. Please acknowledge your source when using the materials and notify EPLO.

Contents

BACKGROUND 1

THEMATIC PRIORITIES 1

- Security and defence 1
- Conflict prevention 3
- Mediation 3
- Recovery 5
- Hybrid and cyber threats 6
- Intersectionality 6
- Transitional justice and human rights 7
- Addressing corruption 8
- Climate change 8
- Gender diversity and SRHR 8
- Funding 8
- The EU's role as a global and diplomatic actor 9

PRIORITIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION 9

PRIORITIES FOR THE DRAFTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION PROCEDURES 10

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS 12

ANNEX I: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 15

Background

From 21 to 23 September 2026, the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office (EPLO), in cooperation with the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the European Commission's (EC) Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), organised a Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) Advanced Training Seminar on 'Engaging with the European Union (EU) on Women, Peace and Security (WPS)'.

This seminar was convened in the context of the renewal of the EU's Action Plan on WPS (AP) and respective upcoming consultations. The overall objective was to provide participants with an analysis of the EU's institutional capacity regarding conflict prevention and peacebuilding and place a particular emphasis on the EU's external action frameworks linking to the WPS agenda. Seminar sessions enabled participants to increase their understanding of the EU as a foreign policy actor, including its frameworks on WPS, and fostered learning and exchange about obstacles and potential of the EU to effectively implement the WPS agenda. Participants also exchanged their advocacy priorities for the upcoming EU WPS AP.

The CSDN seminar was held under the Chatham House Rule and gathered 24 participants from peacebuilding civil society organisations (CSOs). No attempt was made to reach consensus on the issues discussed. The following meeting communication reflects the range of views shared during the seminar. The following sections gather recommendations on key thematic priorities to centre in the next AP, recommendations related to effective implementation as well as recommendations related to the drafting and consultation process.

Thematic priorities

This section gathers key thematic recommendations to centre in the next EU WPS AP identified by participants during the seminar. The order of appearance of each recommendation in this section does not reflect any priority among them.

Security and defence

With security and defence receiving increased attention amid a shifting geopolitical landscape, participants stressed the importance of **framing security beyond national or state security and defence**, to also **encompass resilience, conflict prevention and social cohesion, and of embedding WPS considerations from the outset.** Participants recognised the shift in the geopolitical landscape that the EU is now facing as well as resulting existential threats, particularly for Member States in Eastern Europe. At the same time, they drew attention to the detrimental security effects when fewer resources are available for conflict prevention and peacebuilding. A key risk is that civil society, and in particular **women's voices are not sufficiently heard in discussions on security and defence**, which tend to centre national politicians and military representatives. To

improve this, participants proposed specific action points: 1) to establish a **forum for engagement between CSOs engaged in WPS implementation and security and defence actors**, for example through the EEAS-led Taskforce on WPS, to ensure that WPS expertise is included at tables where security and defence are shaped; 2) to **include WPS perspectives at the Schuman Security and Defence Forum** held every two years; 3) for the next AP to formally commit to **including civil society in the** EU's security and defence partnerships**;** 4) to **increase women's participation in the security sector** and 5) to **include gender perspectives in trainings to the security sector**.

The AP should contribute to **broadening the EU's understanding of security to also encompass women's safety and security in their homes, including through addressing gender-based violence (GBV)**. Participants also highlighted the impact of small arms on women and societies, particularly the links between the proliferation of small arms and rising levels of GBV. They recommended that the EU take these dynamics into account in its understanding of security.

Participants also stressed the **importance of empirically driven research on the intersections between war and gender dynamics,** and that the existing body of research should inform the development of EU WPS policies. Based on the existing body of research, it was recommended that the EU 1) differentiate between military defence and civilian defence/societal resilience, 2) strengthen its capacity to address conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV), including on European soil, 3) strengthen oversight and accountability of EU and Member State military personnel in relation to sexual exploitation and abuse, 4) better understand population movements and the crisis and threats faced by women and girls in these contexts, and 5) recognise the role of AI, emerging technology and big data, including opportunities for prevention that may arise through their development. Participants also referred to research that highlights how attacks on women's rights and structures supporting gender equality often precede backsliding of other democratic state core structures which can result in armed conflict and broader regional and global instability. When women are not safe in third countries, this therefore has impacts on EU citizens as well.

Participants also drew **attention to women and feminist peacebuilders** who are often not in the rooms where decisions are taken that affect their lives even though they carry out essential activities under the WPS agenda, connect across divides and address root causes of armed conflict every day. As a result, participants mentioned that many women peacebuilders feel betrayed by rising military spending and funding cuts while violence and conflict are on the rise. Increasing militarisation and embedded anti-gender movements add further challenges. Discussants stressed that the **EU can lead by example by adopting a people-centred, feminist security lens and by centring civil society in conversations around security**. Participants noted that women's CSOs have been at the heart of the WPS agenda since its origins and bring decade-long expertise on local, regional and global peace and security dynamics. As such, they should be considered essential and engaged as active contributors to current peace and security debates.

Conflict prevention

Discussants shared the view that recent developments show that record military spending does not alone make Europe more secure and that investing in defence is not enough as conflicts continue to rise to the highest numbers since the second World War. A central focus of the recommendations was that **the EU will not be secure unless it focuses on and invests in human security and conflict prevention as well.** This encompasses working on economy, food security, environment, personal and community security and addressing root causes to more effectively carry out prevention.

Participants emphasised that **investing in conflict prevention is more cost-effective and should be better funded**. Once a conflict has already escalated, the human, political and financial costs exceed prevention costs by far. Women's rights organisations (WROs) and networks need to be better resourced because they understand early warning signs and carry out important prevention work. The next AP should therefore recommend direct, flexible and predictable funding for women-led conflict prevention actors, alongside short-term crisis response. Participants also stressed the importance of positioning protection of women peacebuilders as part of prevention measures as both are intractably interlinked: Many women human rights defenders (HRDs) and peacebuilders face online attacks and shrinking civic space. Protection measures allow them to continue their work and support their communities. When women peacebuilders and HRDs are protected, this in turn also supports conflict prevention. It was mentioned that supporting WROs is one of the cheapest ways to prevent conflict. Concrete recommendations involved: funding targets for WROs, funding and resourcing networks, and connecting the knowledge of WROs in fragile and conflict-affected contexts (FCAC) to early warning systems.

Participants also stressed to **not separate the concept of gender equality from the WPS agenda** as gender inequality is a driver of armed conflict. Under the prevention pillar in the current AP, early warning actions are mainly related to GBV. The next AP should place a greater emphasis on the role of women's CSOs in preventing armed conflict.

Discussants also highlighted that the next AP should require for **EU conflict analyses to incorporate an intersectional, gender-responsive perspective and for it to be conducted and regularly** updated throughout the policy and programme cycle. This commitment should be reflected in a dedicated indicator to strengthen accountability for the plan's implementation. Women's CSOs should be explicitly recognised as important contributors to conflict analysis given their contextual knowledge and expertise. The EU should also consider providing dedicated funding to enable women's CSOs to contribute to, and undertake, conflict analysis.

Mediation

Participants stressed **the importance of preserving mediation as part of a broader security toolbox** and that mediation should continue to be a priority in the changing security environment. This means bringing WPS and women mediators' expertise into

forums and strategic discussions where security and defence are shaped. It was also emphasised that the EU should make better use of existing mediation expertise and infrastructure, including by supporting and engaging with women mediator networks. The EU should better recognise and value the expertise, access, trust and local knowledge that these networks bring, and institutionalise engagement with them in consultations and mediation processes.

While participants observed that there is an increasing focus on Track 1 mediation processes internationally now, the **EU has an important and complementary role to play in supporting informal mediation dialogue processes** where women have a critical role to play. This requires long-term engagement and meaningful participation which cannot be achieved by short-term support to women mediators and negotiators. Time is needed to strengthen capacities and develop networks and societal recognition in the long term. The EU should continue to invest in informal mediation processes, through funding and by strategic and political support. Participants noted their perception that the international mediation landscape is increasingly interest-driven and transactional. The EU can use this identified power vacuum as a comparative advantage which lies in the quality of the EU's relationships and cooperation with local civil society. The EU can stand out from other global partners by maintaining sustained engagements where others withdraw.

There are still many barriers to women's participation in peace processes. In the next AP, **the EU should re-commit to breaking down barriers to women's participation in mediation** and political participation at large. Women mediators in Track 1 processes are even more rare. A way to break down the still existing barriers would be to ensure that selection criteria to engage in Track 1 processes value the experiences of women mediators, also at local and community level, as formal experience.

Another point raised by participants was that consultations on peace processes should be a two-way process. CSOs providing input should receive feedback on how their contributions were considered or why they were not taken forward. Consistently closing that feedback loop and following up on commitments builds trust and credibility as a partner in the long term even when formal processes are on halt.

Over the past few years, actors working on WPS and mediation have become increasingly professionalised. They have a lot of expertise and often put themselves at personal risk to engage as mediators. The **EU should engage more and on more equal terms with these actors**. Two structures highlighted as relevant for continued exchange were the Steering Committee of the EU Community of Practice on Peace Mediation (CoP) and the Global Alliance of Regional Women Mediator Networks, which brings together eight regional women mediator networks. More engagement could be organised with these groups that are well organised and have a breadth of experience. One specific recommendation was for these networks to brief EU representatives, for example during induction sessions or during trainings on the geographic contexts in which they will be employed, to improve their understanding of local dynamics and the challenges facing women mediators.

Recovery

While recovery is often discussed in terms of rebuilding infrastructure, **approaches that include gender-responsive recovery and inclusive recovery still need to be better clarified.** Participants noted that, so far, it still often operates an empty signifier that lacks meaning in practice, including clear definitions, targets or indicators. Discussants stressed that women are important recovery actors, not only beneficiaries. As such, the EU should recognise women's agency, economic potential, women's knowledge and skills, and women as community leaders when engaging on the recovery pillar of the WPS agenda.

Participants recommended for the **care economy to be understood as an integral part of the broader economy of a conflict-affected country undergoing recovery.** It was recommended for gender-responsive recovery to take into account the implications of women's disproportionate involvement in unpaid care work and how this compares with their participation in other economy sectors. Conflict settings create significant challenges for caregivers, which affects their ability to participate in public and political life and in paid economic activities. For example, shifts to online schooling in Ukraine have impacted mothers disproportionately in their ability to continue their paid work and pursue economic opportunities. Childcare, support for those injured in conflict and disability-related assistance are therefore essential components of economic recovery. Participants recommended supporting daycare and other care-related services to enable women, who are often the primary caregivers, to take on more active roles in decision-making.

Participants also noted that **conflict and recruitment can reshape the gendered division of labour,** as changes in who performs which roles and tasks can, in turn, shift established gender norms. As women increasingly enter traditionally male-dominated professions and assume positions of political leadership and decision-making power, the EU can support these transitions by investing in women's leadership and mentorship programmes.

Participants also stressed the **importance of preserving and strengthening social fabric as an essential part of recovery**. For example, the reintegration of veterans is an important component of recovery and should be accompanied by programming dealing with masculinities and with the prevention of GBV. While traditional veteran services are mostly designed for men's needs, veteran support in the context of recovery should also include targeted support to women veterans.

Recovery also closely links to **mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS)** which affects not only those affected by CRSV but also civilians in the broader population and security forces who are impacted by living and operating in a conflict-affected setting.

Participants recommended to carry out a **gender-responsive context analysis for recovery projects** and for the EU to support conflict-sensitive, gender-integrated recovery assistance.

Hybrid and cyber threats

Participants noted that **hybrid and cyber threats are an area where misogyny is often part of the strategy of destabilisation**. Misogyny has in some cases been used as a destabilising tactic to attack EU Member States, while anti-gender and anti-rights movements also use online spaces to recruit young boys and men into violent misogynist spaces. The next AP should therefore explicitly address these forms of attack and develop a deeper understanding of the connection between hybrid threats, misogyny and the undermining of EU values and democratic systems. This should include awareness-raising on technology-facilitated GBV and on the gendered nature of hybrid threats and repression against activists, including how these affect polarisation. While men are also targeted online, women HRDs face additional threats and harassment specifically linked to their gender.

It was also stressed that **countering disinformation should not be framed primarily as "countering Russia", but rather as part of an overarching approach to internal resilience**. Countering gender-related disinformation should form part of this approach, while recognising that better information alone does not address the problem, which was identified by participants as an information gap but also a matter of technology literacy. Discussants mentioned that people in vulnerable settings are also more easily recruited in cyberspace, which further highlights the need to strengthen digital and online security. In this regard, participants stressed the need for collecting gender-disaggregated data about cyber threats, sustained support and funding for women's CSOs, including funding for online security protection and digital security training covering data protection, secure communication, investigating interference and disinformation, particularly around elections, as well as safe data storage and the use of satellite phones. The EU's diplomatic missions could play a concrete local role in strengthening this resilience, including by providing digital security training directly. Support should also be provided for the development of cybercrime law. Sustained support to women's CSOs, in turn, contributes to strengthening the resilience and "antibodies" against disinformation.

Intersectionality

Participants stressed the importance to **explicitly recognise and operationalise the nexus between the WPS and YPS agendas**. Young women can face a double exclusion because of their gender and age. Across the world, young women act as agents of change in many roles, and they should be given meaningful opportunities to participate and influence the decisions on peace and security. This intersection should be operationalised through institutionalised consultations with women from diverse backgrounds, joint YPS-WPS consultation mechanisms, dedicated support for young women peacebuilders and their organisations, coordinated financing, and indicators that measure not only young people's presence but also their meaningful participation. Both agendas should remain separate but mutually reinforce each other, instead of operating in parallel.

Similarly, **the role of men and masculinities should be addressed across each WPS pillar**. Participants also stressed the importance of not treating women as a homogeneous group, but of **applying an intersectional approach throughout the WPS agenda**. This means recognising that women's experiences, opportunities for participation and barriers to engagement can differ depending on their age and other aspects of their identities and circumstances. An intersectional approach should therefore inform not only consultations, but also the design, implementation and monitoring of WPS policies and programmes.

Transitional justice and human rights

Participants emphasised that **transitional justice needs to be included more prominently in the AP as a framework for post-conflict rehabilitation, for non-recurrence, recovery and social cohesion.** They mentioned the importance of gender justice and accountability of crimes of conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV) and stressed the importance of women's active participation in post-conflict and transitional justice processes, including criminal justice, trust-building, reparative justice and memorialisation. Discussants also raised that transitional justice support should be about more than the International Criminal Court (ICC) and reflect what justice means to people affected by conflict by supporting the processes through which they seek justice, recognition and recovery. The EU should ensure that it supports transitional justice processes that are gender-transformative by supporting women-led transitional justice processes and ensuring the active participation of women throughout transitional justice processes, including judicial processes.

Participants raised the importance of **supporting women-led and trauma-sensitive processes in post-conflict settings and transitional justice processes**. They recommended for the EU to strengthen the capacities of women and women's platforms to participate more effectively in transitional justice processes, and to create safer spaces for women's participation, including through MHPSS support for victims/survivors of CRSV and for those who work to support survivors. Mental health support should be strengthened as part of transitional justice processes more broadly, as societies affected by trauma require appropriate support for recovery and sustainable peace. Societies affected by collective trauma may also be at greater risk of renewed conflict if their trauma is not adequately addressed.

As mentioned in the sub-chapter on recovery above, transitional justice should also address the **gendered impacts of economic changes during conflict**, including issues such as housing rights. Reparations should therefore be linked to economic and social rights and designed and implemented in a gender-sensitive manner that responds to grievances specifically affecting women, including those related to GBV.

Participants also highlighted the **role of technology in transitional justice and post-conflict settings**, including its potential to support the documentation of crimes. At the same time, the use of technology can also have negative consequences depending on how narratives and information are used, including in the context of misinformation. The

EU should therefore consider these dimensions when supporting transitional justice processes and ensure that documentation and information contribute to processes that are responsive to the experiences and needs of affected communities.

Addressing corruption

The next AP **should address corruption and integrate the WPS agenda and the EU's anti-corruption approaches**. Corruption matters for WPS because it indirectly shapes gender insecurity while also weakening protection. It can take various forms, including sexual extortion, bribery and political interference that obstructs survivors of GBV from accessing justice. Corruption can also facilitate human trafficking and abuses linked to arms transfers and border governance and thereby contribute to conditions that increase the risk of GBV. Participants stressed that the next AP should set out more explicit actions to address and safeguard against institutional and gendered corruption risks. This could include gender-sensitive corruption risk assessments and linking identified risks to appropriate safeguarding, oversight and accountability mechanisms. Participants recommended that corruption be explicitly recognised as a driver of fragility and a risk to WPS implementation.

Climate change

Climate security was mentioned as an often-overlooked element to WPS. Participants suggested that the EU should give greater consideration to the **gendered impacts of climate change and promote women as agents of change and leaders of climate action**. It was recommended to strengthen women's leadership in climate action, strengthen protection of HRDs, including environmental HRDs and those working with indigenous communities, and to increase funding to women-led CSOs at the forefront of climate change in FCAC. Discussions also highlighted the need to broaden the scope of climate action, which means to engage with climate action not only in terms of prevention, but also connecting it to the protection, participation and relief and recovery pillars of WPS.

Gender diversity and SRHR

Another overlooked element raised by participants was the insufficient recognition of gender in all its diversity. Participants highlighted the need for the next AP to adopt a more inclusive understanding of gender and to **recognise gender in all its diversity**. In addition, discussants stressed that the current framework insufficiently addresses the 'rights' element in 'Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR)'. However, in FCAC, access to SRHR is often not a given and can be life-determining. Support to SRHR therefore needs to remain politically supported and the "rights" element specifically emphasised in the next plan.

Funding

Participants stressed the **importance of sustained funding for women's CSOs and of ensuring that such funding supports all pillars of the WPS agenda**. They also emphasised

that investing in these organisations is also a contribution to conflict prevention and recovery.

In this context, participants highlighted the growing role of private financing and banking, including through loans to women entrepreneurs and stressed the importance of ensuring that women are protected from and safeguarded against the risks associated with market-based approaches in economic contexts that remain affected by conflict.

The EU's role as a global and diplomatic actor

The next AP should therefore clearly commit to **advancing the WPS agenda in multilateral fora.** The EU was identified as one of the few remaining actors actively engaged in multilateralism. Participants noted their perception that recent UN Security Council decisions have included fewer explicit references to the WPS agenda than in previous years. The EU plays an important coordination role with Member States and is recognised as an important convening actor. It is therefore well placed to promote specific coordination and exchanges across UN Member States and should help open or sustain spaces for engagement with other actors, including civil society.

Participants critically discussed the EU's ability to lead by example, as set out as a current pillar of its WPS AP. Specifically, participants raised concerns about the lack of gender balance among EU Special Representatives, many of whom are involved in high-level negotiations. It was stressed **that integrating a gender equality lens in high-level spaces is essential**.

Priorities for implementation

Participants stressed that the **EU WPS AP should be designed to support meaningful implementation at field level, rather than becoming an additional bureaucratic or "tick-box" exercise.** They noted that policy documents are often not used by those responsible for implementing programmes, particularly at field level. The next AP should therefore consider how its objectives and commitments can be translated into accessible, practical guidance for non-bureaucratic audiences. It should also clarify the AP's place within existing policy frameworks and institutional hierarchies, and how WPS commitments should be systematically integrated across relevant thematic areas. The challenge is to maintain ambition while ensuring that the AP is practical, accessible and actively used by programme implementers, line managers and senior leadership.

Discussants also recommended for the EU to establish a **clear WPS mandate for all EU leadership, EU Ambassadors, Special Envoys and Special Representatives** to ensure a consistent approach to WPS across its external action and avoid institutional silos.

Participants also suggested for **the next WPS AP to establish meaningful indicators that are relevant and useful to those implementing programmes, while supporting effective monitoring and accountability.** Lessons from the previous AP, particularly regarding the

development of indicators and the monitoring of implementation, should inform the next framework. Concrete recommendations included for the relationship between the WPS AP and the Gender Action Plan (GAP) frameworks to be clearly defined, with their respective roles and indicators delineated and their implementation aligned. The development of indicators for the next WPS AP should build on existing evidence and lessons learned to ensure that progress can be tracked and assessed in a systematic and accessible manner. Accountability should also be strengthened by integrating the EU WPS perspective into bilateral agreements and partnerships, as well as through gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) for WPS.

Finally, **implementation of the WPS AP should be supported through stronger engagement with EU Member States and Council structures.** Discussants mentioned that relevant topics should be discussed in Council working groups, with civil society organisations invited to provide briefings to the Council and Member States. The next WPS AP should also include indicators addressing cyber threats, ensuring that this dimension is reflected in implementation and monitoring frameworks.

Priorities for the drafting process and consultation procedures

With the next EU WPS AP expected to be endorsed in 2027 and consultations starting in autumn 2026**, the drafting process should address not only the content of the document, but also its methodology to ensure that it becomes an active policy that guides implementation.** The process should be developed in close collaboration with civil society, including local CSOs, whose expertise and perspectives are essential to ensuring that the AP responds to the realities of women in conflict-affected contexts.

Local civil society and research actors should be involved throughout implementation, not only during policy development. Participants stressed that consultation with local CSOs remains limited at EU Delegation (EUD) level, despite their important knowledge of conflict-affected contexts and the barriers to advancing gender equality in these contexts. The next WPS AP should therefore strengthen regular and meaningful consultation with local CSOs. With so called 'anti-gender' actors increasingly mobilising against gender equality and women's rights, the EU should also ensure that consultation spaces are safe and protected against undue influence, to avoid exposing participants to harm.

Research institutes and CSOs that generate data and evidence should also be engaged systematically during implementation. Existing research, including findings from EU-funded Horizon research, can help identify how pathways towards gender equality and women's empowerment in FCAC intersect with different gender norms, disruptions and experiences of violence. These context-specific differences should inform the design and implementation of WPS interventions to ensure that engagement is appropriately

targeted. Collaboration should therefore extend beyond the drafting phase to inform implementation, monitoring and learning.

Consultation procedures should be designed to avoid extractive processes and **ensure that participation is meaningful, safe and adequately resourced**. This requires sufficient time and funding, clear communication about the purpose of consultations and how contributions will be used, and realistic expectations about the extent to which participants' recommendations can be reflected in the final document. A good practice would be to share the draft policy with those consulted, allowing them to see how their input has been reflected and helping to build trust in the process. The burden of engagement should also not fall disproportionately on women and women's CSOs in fragile and conflict-affected contexts. EUDs and their EU counterparts should proactively reach out to women's CSOs, including through regular consultations, rather than relying on these organisations to initiate contact. Particular attention should be paid to engagement by EUDs, FPI regional hubs and CSDP missions, clarifying their respective roles and approaches to consultation with civil society and ensuring that engagement is adapted to different contexts and actors.

Participants also stressed the value they place on **institutionalised exchanges with EU interlocutors on WPS.** Participants also suggested that the EEAS-led Taskforce on WPS, which brings together Member States, EU institutions and civil society, should resume meetings more frequently. It was noted that the Taskforce previously served as an important platform for regular exchange between these actors on implementation of the WPS agenda. Such a platform could provide continuity beyond the drafting process, with civil society able to propose agenda items for meetings and contribute to discussions on implementation. Building on previous consultation experiences, including those associated with the GAP, the next WPS AP process should provide clear opportunities for sustained dialogue between civil society and EU institutions, including at EUD level.

Finally, the drafting process should **maintain ambition in its language and commitments**, avoiding a lowest-common-denominator approach that risks diluting existing progress. The EU should continue to defend progressive WPS language in international fora.

Decisions taken during the drafting process will have significant implications for women's safety in conflict-affected contexts. It is therefore **essential that women and women's CSOs have meaningful influence** over these decisions and that their contributions inform both the commitments set out in the AP and their subsequent implementation.

Key recommendations

1. **Security and defence**
    - **Broaden the EU's understanding of security** beyond state and military security to include human security, conflict prevention, resilience and social cohesion, and embed WPS from the outset.
    - **Institutionalise civil society and women's participation in security and defence**, including through the WPS Task Force, the Schuman Security and Defence Forum and EU security and defence partnerships.
    - **Integrate gender perspectives into the security sector**, including through women's participation, gender-sensitive training and accountability of military actors.

2. **Conflict prevention**
    - **Make conflict prevention and human security a core component of EU security policy,** addressing root causes and the economic, environmental, personal and community dimensions of security.
    - **Invest in women's CSOs and peacebuilders as conflict prevention actors**, through direct, flexible and predictable funding, protection measures and links to early-warning systems.
    - **Require intersectional, gender-responsive and regularly updated conflict analysis,** with women's CSOs involved and adequately supported as contributors and analysts.

3. **Mediation**
    - **Preserve mediation as part of the EU's broader security toolbox** and systematically integrate WPS and women mediators' expertise into peace and security processes.
    - **Strengthen long-term EU support for women mediators and informal mediation,** including through funding, political support and institutionalised engagement with women mediator networks.
    - **Remove barriers to women's meaningful participation in peace processes** and ensure that civil society consultations include feedback on how contributions were considered.

4. **Recovery**
    - **Define and operationalise gender-responsive and inclusive recovery,** including through clear objectives, targets and indicators.
    - **Recognise women as actors of recovery**, including through support for women's economic participation, leadership and the care economy.
    - **Integrate social cohesion, MHPSS and gender-responsive**

conflict analysis into recovery approaches, including in veteran reintegration and GBV prevention.

5. **Hybrid and cyber threats**
    - **Address misogyny, anti-gender mobilisation and gender-related disinformation as dimensions of hybrid and cyber threats** and threats to democratic resilience.
    - **Strengthen digital and online security for women's CSOs and HRDs,** including through sustained funding, digital security training and support from EU diplomatic missions.
    - **Strengthen the EU's understanding of gendered cyber threats,** including through gender-disaggregated data, technology literacy and support for cybercrime legislation.

6. **Intersectionality**
    - **Operationalise the WPS-YPS nexus,** including through joint consultations, dedicated support for young women peacebuilders, coordinated financing and meaningful participation indicators.
    - **Address and include men and masculinities across WPS pillars.**
    - **Apply an intersectional approach throughout WPS**, recognising the different experiences and barriers faced by women depending on age and other aspects of identity and circumstances.

7. **Transitional justice and human rights**
    - **Give transitional justice a more prominent place in the WPS AP,** including as a framework for recovery, rehabilitation, non-recurrence and social cohesion.
    - **Ensure gender-responsive transitional justice**, including support for women's participation and leadership, gender-sensitive reparations, and accountability for CRSV.
    - **Integrate MHPSS,** economic and social rights, and the responsible use of technology into transitional justice and post-conflict approaches.

8. **Addressing corruption**
    - **Integrate WPS and anti-corruption approaches**, recognising corruption as a driver of fragility and risk to WPS implementation.
    - **Address gendered corruption risks** through gender-sensitive risk assessments, safeguarding, oversight and accountability mechanisms.

9. **Climate change**
    - **Strengthen the climate-security dimension of WPS**, including the gendered impacts of climate change and climate-related conflict risks.
    - **Support women as climate leaders and protect women and**

environmental HRDs, including through increased funding for women-led CSOs.
- **Connect climate action to all WPS pillars.**

10. Gender diversity and SRHR
- **Recognise gender in all its diversity** in the next WPS AP.
- **Explicitly recognise and protect the rights dimension of SRHR** and maintain political support for SRHR in FCAC.

11. Funding
- **Ensure direct, sustained, flexible and predictable funding for women's CSOs and WROs across all WPS pillars.**
- **Integrate WPS into recovery and economic financing**, while safeguarding women from risks associated with market-based approaches in FCAC.

12. EU global and diplomatic role
- **Strengthen the EU's role in advancing WPS in multilateral fora,** including through coordination with Member States and engagement with civil society.
- **Use the EU's convening role to sustain international spaces for WPS dialogue and cooperation**.
- **Lead by example on gender equality in EU diplomacy**, including by addressing gender imbalance in high-level diplomatic positions.

13. Implementation
- **Ensure a clear WPS mandate for EU leadership, Ambassadors, Special Envoys and Special Representatives, CSDP missions, FPI regional hubs and EUDs**, and make the WPS AP practical and accessible for those responsible for its implementation at field level.
- **Establish meaningful indicators, clear AP-GAP alignment and stronger accountability through GRB.**
- **Strengthen implementation through Council and Member State engagement,** including structured civil society briefings and monitoring of cyber threats.

14. Drafting process and consultation
- **Develop the AP through sustained, meaningful and adequately resourced engagement with civil society,** including local CSOs and research actors.
- **Ensure safe, non-extractive consultations**, with EU actors proactively reaching out to women's CSOs and providing feedback on how their input was reflected.
- **Institutionalise regular WPS dialogue between EU institutions, Member States and civil society**.

Annex I: List of abbreviations

AP	Action Plan (referring to EU WPS Action Plan)
CRSV	Conflict-related sexual violence
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSDN	Civil Society Dialogue Network
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
EC	European Commission
EEAS	European External Action Service
EPLO	European Peacebuilding Liaison Office
EU	European Union
EUD	EU Delegation
FCAC	Fragile and conflict-affected contexts
FPI	Service for Foreign Policy Instruments
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GBV	Gender-based violence
GRB	Gender-responsive budgeting
HDP	Humanitarian-Development-Peace
HRD	Human rights defender
ICC	International Criminal Court
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
MHPSS	Mental health and psychosocial support
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
SRHR	Sexual and reproductive health and rights
WPS	Women, Peace and Security
WRO	Women's rights organisation
YPS	Youth, Peace and Security