

Explanatory note for 12th March 2010 NGO Consultation

on

Women, Peace and Security Indicator development

In recognition of the key role that civil society actors around the world play in the implementation and monitoring of women, peace and security measures, the NGOWG on Women, Peace and Security was invited by UNIFEM and OSAGI to convene a civil society consultation on the indicator report on SCR 1325, as requested in SCR 1889, OP 17:

“...a set of indicators for use at the global level to track implementation of its resolution 1325 (2000), which could serve as a common basis for reporting by relevant United Nations entities, other international and regional organizations, and Member States, on the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) in 2010 and beyond”

As a result of this consultation, and despite the tight timeline, more than 150 suggestions to improve the indicators were provided by NGO colleagues from around the world. While incomplete as a consultation of all those civil society actors who have valid and useful input to give in this process, the degree of expertise reflected in this consultation demonstrates the importance of continuing to substantively engage with NGOs as the indicators continue to be honed and improved.

Because of the short time-period, and because many key civil society representatives were not able to present in New York on this date, we sought to ensure that our consultation system allowed as many voices to be heard as possible. Our goal was to have clear, concerted, and constructive messages – from those who can attend and those who cannot – to bring the consultation on the 12th March.

In preparation for this meeting, on 3rd March 2010 the NGOWG sent NGO colleagues the TWGGI’s background report for the selection of indicators. On 9th March 2010, the TWGGI made available the current “shortlist” of draft indicators to the participants in the consultation.

Input from NGO colleagues:

In order to collect the most information possible within the tight deadline, participants in the process were asked to provide responses to the following key questions regarding their pillar(s) of interest:

1. Which indicators should be kept?
2. What indicator(s) should be modified/added (any suggestions for additions should be specific and concrete)?
3. What is the key “must have” for this pillar that you would like discussed at the 12th March consultation?

Participants were asked to submit their input to the focal points listed below:

1. Prevention – Sarah Wikenczy (OSI/NGOWG)
2. Participation – Melissa Langworthy (WRC/NGOWG)
3. Protection – Maria Butler (PeaceWomen/NGOWG) and Steven Schoofs (IA)
4. Relief and Recovery – Charlotte Onslow (GAPS UK)

As results were submitted, the NGOWG and GAPS UK personnel listed above started analyzing the common themes, revisions, and additions to the current draft indicators. These were categorized in tables that reflected key messages, why they are important to include, and what suggested indicators might reflect these issues.

Immediately following the 12th March Consultation, we provided the following draft documents to the drafters of the report:

- Tables for each of the four pillars with key messages and suggestions for the draft indicators
- A full listing of all comments received, sorted by pillar when possible

Please note that these are preliminary analyses and suggestions, as the timing was so short for the consultation. The materials included here should not be considered final statements for public distribution.

In conclusion, the three key messages we would like to emphasize are:

1. It is clear that there has been insufficient time and access – such as translation - to include all key voices in this process. We are looking forward to civil society actors being an integral part of the process of evaluating the indicators as they are adopted, and ensuring that as the indicators are strengthened and honed, civil society expertise is substantively included and drawn upon.
2. Developing a set of indicators is not the end goal of this process. The goal of this process is to see action taken and positive results for women in conflict. Therefore, the outcome of this indicator process should be:

A set of strong, meaningful indicators developed through this process must be delivered to the Security Council, and the Council must in turn live up to its obligations to women in conflict by:

- Endorsing strong indicators to regularly receive information on the whole women, peace and security agenda;
- Evaluating the implementation of women, peace and security obligations with these indicators;
- And taking appropriate and effective action on the information received.

All relevant actors – member states, UN actors, Security Council members - should be held accountable for their obligations.

3. Additional strong indicators developed in this process that are not included in the final indicator report should be made publicly available for other actors – including civil society actors and governments – to use in their ongoing work on women, peace and security.

The NGOWG members area available for more questions or additional input on any of the above information, and look forward to continuing to work with you on this important project. We will continue to provide any further suggestions our NGO colleagues contribute.

Sarah Taylor
Executive Coordinator
NGOWG on Women, Peace and Security

ANNEX I: General Observations and Tables for each of the four pillars with key messages and suggestions for the draft indicators

General observations for consideration for the Global Indicator Report

- **PILLARS:** pillars are not necessarily the clearest or most effective way to understand/organise WPS intervention/impact (arbitrary/silos). Report must be more explicit in talking about cross over and interconnectivity. Eg: prevention pillar crossing over with participation: women's empowerment indicators feed into prevention of conflict. Preventing conflict and addressing the root causes of violence should be clearly linked with women's empowerment and inclusion in all decision-making.
- **PILLAR DEFINITIONS LINKING TO OUTCOMES AND INDICATORS:** P.3 many outcomes for each pillar are not linked to indicators for the same pillars. E.g: (i) Participation outcome 3 talks of local governance but no indicator refers to local governance; (ii) Relief and Recovery outcome 2. refers to transitional justice and outcome 3 to SSR. No indicators have been linked to transitional justice or SSR.
- **ETHICAL COLLECTION OF DATA** ethical collection of data and tracking such data is a key issue that comes up with partners – civil society should reiterate their concern about this especially around incidence of SGBV.
- **LIVING DOCUMENT:** (i) The indicators (if adopted) should be explicitly seen as a living set of indicators to be reviewed and refined after a set period of time (pilot phase). Prob/challenges with the indicators and collecting data should be collected to ensure future improvements in measuring 1325; (ii) the pillars should also be reviewed following a set period of time to assess if they are the most effective/practical way to understand 1325 in practice.
- **DATA POPULATION:** Need for clear instructions on populating the data to UN Heads of agencies (even before SC consider endorsement).
- **QUALITATIVE INFORMATION:** Report needs to explicitly show how qualitative information/analysis will support the quantitative information collected – not clear in the current report draft.
- **LONG LIST OF INDICATORS:** To include long list of indicators for non UN actors to use in their monitoring of 1325 at national and local level.
- **FRAMING 1325 CLEARLY AS HUMAN SECURITY and LINKING THIS TO SOCIAL ATTITUDES:** Placing prevention “of all forms of structural and physical violence against women and girls” with in the framework of human security (dignity, freedom from fear, freedom from

want). This also helps us link it to MDGs. Indicators that can help establish a picture of human security are: Social attitudes to SGBV; Social attitudes to impunity to SGBV; Social attitudes to human rights; Social attitudes to police and formal justice.

- **TRAINING:** Lack of mention of training/capacity building/awareness raising – key interventions in seeking to change to gender inequality/violence. This should be explicitly linked to social attitudes indexes also. Possible indicators (taken from longlist):
 - Increased public awareness of women’s rights and issues among men and women
 - Public perceptions on whether women are/should be subject to traditional law (Afrobarometer):
 - Level of increase of knowledge among the public of SGBV issues and SGBV prosecution (PBSO, UNDP)

- **LANGUAGE AND DEFINITIONS:** (i) SGBV must be given an explicitly broad definition (to include FGM, trafficking; freedom of movement etc.) and SGBV must be used consistently through out to ensure continuity. (ii) Gender issues is too vague a term and it should be more explicitly women's rights, such as in indicator 18, 19 and 21.

Participation			
	KEY MESSAGES	WHY?	SUGGESTIONS
1.	LANGUAGE AND DEFINITIONS - There must be clarity that these indicators are measuring meaningful participation - There must be clarity that there must be substantive inclusion of women’s rights and concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language is vague on ensuring more than token participation • Replace measurements of ‘representation’ with ‘participation’ • Language fails to recognize that ‘women’ is not a homogenous group: eg widows, disabled, indigenous, ethnicity, LGBTI, etc. • Presence of a female does not guarantee attention to women’s issues • Language fails to define roles for women’s participation • There needs to be large-scale recognition of ‘freedom of movement’ as restrictive to women’s participation across all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 1 could be: ‘Index of female participation in UN decision-making related to peace and security matters’ • Possibly measure time allotted to women for speaking in peace process • Indicator 3 (suggested): ‘Index of female participation in peace negotiations and peace-building related processes’ • Percentage of women should include their rank in peacekeeping missions. -This includes both uniformed and civilian personnel. • Define roles to ensure meaningful interchange of ideas

		participation measurements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Indicator 2: ‘substantive consultations’ -Indicator 3: ‘mediator’ and ‘negotiator’ -Indicator 5: ‘eligible’ women
	CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT needs to be strengthened, and challenges to participation included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observer status does not ensure participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indicator 3: ‘Proportion of negotiating period when women’s civil society groups have formal observer status’ • Security concerns are a specific and common obstacle for women engaged in peace processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurement should indicate the actual contribution to the dialogue – ie meaningful and substantive participation – should be “consultative status” • Measurement should reflect challenges to CSO participation
	ACCOUNTABILITY AND IMPACT needs to be clearly defined in requirements for UN/Security Council missions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attention to women’s participation throughout the different mission phases within the Security Council: Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing gender in TOR is not sufficient. In Indicator 2 - How is the implementation here being measured? In the 'notes' section it is mentioned that a 'checklist will be completed to assess which gender-related elements have been included in that mission'... I would suggest that this checklist indicate whether these suggestions came from consultations with women's (and other) civil society groups, otherwise I think it is difficult to gauge whether the outcomes of these 'participatory' events have actually had any impact on the final outcome document. Potential improvement: ‘Number and % of completed and ongoing SC missions that include (d) a specific gender dimension at every level of implementation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Planning: was a gender advisor appointed? Were consultative meetings held with women’s groups? -Implementation: “# and % of peace agreements implemented with specific...” since so many peace agreements are incompletely realized? -Evaluation: Number of meeting with civil society organizations through the mission duration.
	MISSING INDICATORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative indicators that would capture women’s input and not just presence • Women’s role in the judiciary is absent. The judiciary is a critical component of post-conflict and reconstructive justice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and use proxy indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Measure gender balance at negotiating/mediating/advisory sessions • Add measurement of women prosecutors and judges to

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforce quota systems throughout peace and security processes • Percentage of IDP/refugee women in IDP/refugee camp management structures. 	<p>existing Political Participation measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support male and female candidates presented for each position at SC, national and local level; enact quotas in establishing political representation
--	--	---	--

PROTECTION			
	KEY MESSAGES	WHY?	SUGGESTIONS
1.	<p>QUALITATIVE INDICATORS:</p> <p>SGBV</p> <p>(no.15)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more specific indicators to measure barriers to reporting on SGBV- stigma; shame; culture; perception; fear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to measure existence of barriers to reporting and/or prosecution and estimated percentage of woman who fail to report because of such barriers (i.e. medical fees for rape examinations, prosecution for adultery, stigmatization and marginalization from community, culture, perception, fear, statute of limitations, difficult burden of proof, etc.) • Possible indicator using maternal mortality
2.	<p>EXPAND CATEGORY OF WOMEN</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women need to be disaggregated by groups that include single/widows, girls, displacement considerations, etc. 	
3.	<p>ECONOMIC SECURITY</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing women's economic security does not mean that they are safer from gender-based violence. For example, women may have access to credit, but may not have control over how that credit is spent. Male family members may psychological or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop indicator on access to resources

		physically harm women who have access to financial resources.	
4	OPERATIONAL MECHANISMS AND STRUCTURES TO PROTECT WOMEN AND GIRLS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is outcome 2 needs more specific indicators to measure this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure the existence of vetting procedures that screen current and new members of the security forces on the involvement in SGBV crimes.
6	NEED INDICATORS TO CAPTURE MORE THAN SGBV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion to include broad definition of SGBV to include other crimes against women like honour crimes, FGM and forced marriage which are part of the picture of repression of women's rights and part of early warning and include measures of domestic violence and of trafficking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need an indicator that quantifies violations and abuses against women in addition to SGBV

Prevention

	KEY MESSAGES	WHY?	SUGGESTIONS
1.	CONFLICT PREVENTION definition on p.3 includes "preventing relapse into	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need specific indicators on early warning and conflict prevention. 	CONFLICT PREVENTION INDICATORS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and select key gender specific indicators for early warning and integrate into response systems

	conflict” but no indicators relating to conflict prevention/early warning.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early warning indicators and systems used by UN agencies are gender responsive (output) • Develop proxy indicators that assess women’s sense of safety and security (freedom of fear)
2	ABUSES AND VIOLATIONS BEYOND SGBV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All current prevention indicators are limited to SGBV. • There is a need for broader and more explicit articulation of physical and structural violence beyond SGBV and explicitly focuses on abuses and violations that impact women and girls, such as freedom of movement; forced displacement; forced recruitment and abductions, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to develop an indicator(s) that captures abuses and violations beyond SGBV
3.	CLEAR DEFINITION OF SGBV What counts as SGBV? Does it include: early marriage; harmful traditional practices; denial of resources, opportunities and services; FGM; transactional sex; trafficking? This is directly relevant for indicator 6, 8 and 9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual violence and SGBV in some instances seem to be used interchangeably 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGBV should be given a clear but broad definition that includes early marriage; harmful traditional practices; denial of resources, opportunities and services; FGM; transactional sex; trafficking • All reference to sexual violence should be termed as SGBV
4.	OUTCOMES AND INDICATORS ARE NOT CONNECTED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results framework defines prevention outcomes in terms of “gender-responsive systems...to monitor and report” and “actors... held to account for any violations”. There are no indicators that link directly to monitoring and reporting, and accountability (beyond SGBV) • Need indicators that demonstrate legislation and enforcement around military/national security, justice and police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. and % of legislation that help protect the rights of women and girls • No and % of local laws that contain specific provisions pertaining to SGBV and women’s rights • Women seek justice against their assailants • Need indicator to measure enforcement and/or access • Indicator for military expenditures and tracking on weapons

Relief and Recovery

	KEY MESSAGES	WHY?	SUGGESTIONS
1.	<p>LANGUAGE</p> <p>definitions need to be improved regarding “gender” and “women”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would suggest replacing gender issues with women’s rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language in Ind. 18, 19, 21 – conflation of gender issues with women’s rights Indicators 18 and 19: “funding for gender issues” needs to be operationalised, i.e. what counts as a “gender issue”?
2.	<p>LACK OF LINKAGE BETWEEN OUTCOMES AND INDICATORS</p> <p>Transitional Justice and SSR: Relief and Recovery Outcome 2 (see p. 3) refers to transitional justice and Outcome 3 to SSR, however no indicators have been linked to TJ or SSR outcomes. Need to develop</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only disaggregated data in indicators is on DDR (#23) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of any amnesty provisions (i.e., in peace agreements, constitutions, domestic legislation, etc.) or other barriers to justice Existence of domestic laws ensuring reparations and redress as required for victims of international crimes regardless of prosecutions.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No IMPACT indicator for R&R – at least one impact indicator must be included No QUALITATIVE indicator for R&R – at least one must be included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure substance of work is reflected, not solely number of women present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative indicator around level of stigma towards female ex-combatants or camp supporters??
5.	<p>Problems with pillar divisions (lack of interconnectivity)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. 20: Only covers inclusion of provisions to address women and girls rights by ad hoc peace commissions. Indicator 4 (in participation pillar) belongs in the R&R pillar. It is not an impact indicator. It is an outcome indicator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator 24 should also track women’s participation in ad-hoc commissions. Move indicator 4 from Pillar 1 to Pillar 4 and mark it as an outcome indicator.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

- Pillars: pillars are not the clearest or most effective way to understand/organising WPS intervention/impact. They are somewhat arbitrary and the term “pillar” creates an understanding of silos, guiding one to believe they should be tackled separately and that there is no cross over.
- Cross over: Prevention pillar needs recognize cross over with participation, whereby with women’s empowerment indicators feed into prevention of conflict. Preventing conflict and addressing the root causes of violence should be clearly linked with women’s empowerment and inclusion in all decision-making.
- Pillar definitions: The above is further compounded by the pillar definitions which are not neither rigorous nor sophisticated. The pillars and their def should be noted as being a guide for international community – that they can be reviewed rather than that is the only way to understand 1325.
- Living Doc: (i) The indicators (if adopted) should be seen as a living set of indicators to be reviewed and refined after a set period of time. Prob/challenges with the indicators and collecting data should be collected to ensure future improvements in measuring 1325; (ii) the pillars should also be reviewed following a set period of time to assess if they are the most effective/practical way to understand 1325 in practice.
- Ethical collection of data: ethical collection of data and tracking such data is a key issue that comes up with partners – civil society should reiterate their concern about this especially around incidence of SGBV.
- Qualitative indicators: Only one qualitative – proxy for fear (within Ind. 16). There must be more indicators on perceptions e.g. perceptions of safety and security of women; perceptions of women’s influence in decision making processes.
- Lack of linkage betw. Outcomes and indicators: p.3 many outcomes for each pillar are not linked to indicators for the same pillars. E.g: (i) Participation outcome 3 talks of local governance but no indicator refers to local governance; (ii) Relief and Recovery outcome 2. refers to transitional justice and outcome 3 to SSR. No indicators have been linked to TJ or SSR.
- more on prevention – recognising that women on the ground will often see conflict brewing and have creative solutions and prevention ideas, if only they were consulted and listened to. Prevention should not only be concerned with preventing a reoccurrence of conflict but also should look at root causes and what might be done to address them to prevent conflict in the first place. Women would be good at this and the insights into what is really going on. The list contains a mixture of ambitious (unrealistic?) indicators and very generic/modest indicators (probably a result of the various trade-offs involved)
- It is quite striking that there are no impact/outcome indicators around capacity development, awareness-raising and training. Considering that these activities are the staple of interventions seeking to change gender regimes (and likely a key prevention method), there should at least be one indicator (or index) on this. Or are we saying that these types of interventions are not working and that there is no point in measuring impact/outcome?? Possible indicators (taken from longlist:
- Increased public awareness of women’s rights and issues among men and women
- Public perceptions on whether women are/should be subject to traditional law (Afrobarometer):

- Level of increase of knowledge among the public of SGBV issues and SGBV prosecution (PBSO, UNDP)
- Need for clear instruction on populating the data to UN Heads of agencies (even before SC consider endorsement)
- Indicator on the % military spending compared to gender spending maybe?
- Our view is that indicators on judicial independence, access to justice mechanisms and legislative reform are all key.
- The International Criminal Court in the Hague should play a role in the struggle against violence against women in conflict situations. They propose to add an indicator like: "Cases handled by the ICC with a direct element of violence perpetrated against women"
- They prefer more focus on local and grass-root women organisations, confronted daily with conflict prevention and conflict resolution. The pillar Participation says: 'improve partnership and networking with local and international women's rights groups and organizations'. This could become an indicator for the number of women organisations and the cooperation with international ngo's.
- Will they accompanied by a list of suggested carrots and sticks to encourage compliance with the Resolutions? What are the incentives and/or sanctions?
- Budgets increased for compliance or money docked from budgets for non-compliance?
- These Indicators made a consideration in Career appraisals?
- Pillars are artificial & that there is a lack of interconnectivity between them. That said, from a methodological point of view, I also understand why the pillars need to be constructed, so I would only say that more work needs to be done to make these 'interconnectivity' points clearer.
- Proxy indicators need to be more widely explored, as does the use of more qualitative indicators throughout. I think that you've already received some suggestions on how to go about this in particular instances, and I've also included some of my thoughts below.
- Pillar make things more complicated, e.g. women's participation is also very much part of protection, and vice versa. This said, I think reporting should still take place using different heading just to make clear to everyone the comprehensiveness approach of 1325.
- For this pillar (Prevention) it seems like you'd also want to have some type of early warning system in place to detect SGBV instead of waiting on "periodic reports," though that would be another indicator.
- (How to include a country's defense spending in one or more of the indicators?)
- We all know that what a country spends on its "war" budget robs women of progress in every social need. Yet the military budget remains the elephant in the room, almost untouchable in every discussion of women's rights.)
- The Beijing Platform requires nations to "reduce excessive military expenditures and control availability of armaments." So far we have seen almost no progress in either as world spending on both hovers around the trillion dollar level.
- Each of the four pillars could have a strong component of the above requirement:
 - Prevention: relapse into conflict is triggered by weapons acquirement and military build-up.
 - Participation: Women are denied any role in determining military spending and importation of weapons.
 - Protection: Excessive weapons and militarization play a part in every failure to insure the security of girls and women.

- Relief and Recovery: Excessive military spending and arms build-up prolong and prevent economic recovery as well as efforts at reconciliation.

PREVENTION

- Conflict Prevention: include some outcomes and indicators explicitly relating to the prevention of conflict rather than focusing solely on structural and physical violence. Conflict prevention has been overlooked in favour of SGBV (also this is related to definition of Prevention Pillar). Include some existing gender sensitive conflict prevention/peace consolidation indicators be incorporated
- Women feel that conflict preventions interventions reflect their needs and priorities (QUAL);
- Male-to-female ratio of both implementers and beneficiaries of peace education projects (QUANT)
- Early Warning Systems: EWS in Prevention Section: similarly early warning mechanisms/institutions indicators need to be linked to conflict prevention more explicitly rather than only to be linked to levels of violence against women.
- Maternal Mortality: Maternal mortality/morbidity has dropped off. It should be an indicator under prevention especially linked to sexual violence (rape).
ONLY SGBV as physical security: must be explicit focus on other WHR violations e.g. freedom of movement; property rights etc. Independence and coverage of monitoring of violations of women and girl's human rights in conflict situations by Human Rights Bodies, including mechanisms to identify perpetrators (modification to existing indicator)
- Percentage allocated funding to develop capacity of national courts to address incidents of sexual violence
- Independence of the judiciary and extent to which national judges give serious consideration to reports of sexual violence
- Extent to which local laws have incorporated international crimes, including under the Geneva and Genocide Conventions and the Rome Statute, which contain specific provisions pertaining to sexual and gender-based violence
- No. 10. why is this not under protection?
- The results framework frames the long-term impact for the prevention pillar in terms of “all forms of structural and physical violence against women and girls”. Yet, the majority of prevention indicators centre on SGBV.
- What counts as SGBV? Does it include: early marriage; harmful traditional practices; denial of resources, opportunities and services; FGM; transactional sex? This is directly relevant for indicator 6, 8 and 9.
- Indicator 6: need to define SC actions (rhetoric is not good enough!)
- Indicator 8: standardised operational definition for SGBV is important for situational reporting + reporting is not prevention!
- Indicator 11: incidence of sexual violence: is this a realistic indicator for conflict-affected contexts?
- The results framework defines outcomes for the prevention pillar in terms of “gender-responsive systems.....to monitor and report” and “actors..... held to account for any violations”. Given these envisaged outcomes, the current indicators seem rather weak and far from comprehensive. At a minimum, there should be indicators on:
 - Legislation and law enforcement (no indicators on this in the whole document!!)

- The crucial monitoring role of CSOs, especially in resource-trapped contexts (possible suggestion: no. of local organisations supported to monitor SGBV, although there is a practical need for standardization re CSO monitoring)
- Compliance of peacekeeping troops with CoCs and SOPs (yes, politically sensitive but let's at least ask some tough questions on zero-tolerance!)
- (1) extent to which gender specific data and early warning indicators have been developed and integrated into early warning-early response systems, including national security policy, to ensure effective conflict prevention
- (2) extent to which women's networks have been trained and supported to collect data and provide analyses to ensure an integration of gender perspective into all situation and conflict analyses and subsequent programming;
- (3) availability of national and regional reports which define the gender dimensions of peace processes and conflict resolution that identifies the critical security threats in various regions Also regarding national level programming: How can we gauge support provided to convene and strengthen national and regional government/NGO Women, Peace and Security Committees to develop national/relevant action plans for the implementation of 1325 including:
 - a. Developing training workshops, awareness raising toolkits and guidelines to support 1325 implementation.
 - b. Translating 1325 into local languages.
 - c. Documenting and sharing relevant experiences, information and strategies
 - d. Enable women's civil society input into all aspects of conflict prevention, management, formal negotiations and resolution, including all reconstruction efforts, through improved consultative processes and capacity building, and ensuring sustained interaction and solidarity
- Indicators to be kept: 6, 8 (see comment below), 9
- No 7: need specification on how to measure independence and coverage.
- No 8: it's not just about SGBV reporting; it is about the inclusion of a (broader) gender-perspective.
- Additional: what about gender-sensitive early warning mechanisms and institutions? (mentioned in annex C under prevention)
- Additional: what about inclusion women / women's organizations in mission planning, implementation, etc. as preventive measure? (e.g. index of female representation in mission planning processes)
- Indicator 7: I don't think we can reliably measure "Independence" of monitoring; introducing such a value judgment is problematic. I think measuring monitoring actions is a more feasible indicator.
- Indicator 9: The second part calls for the No. and percentage of standing operating procedures (I assume is "standard" operating procedures, SOPs). I don't think any security forces have a "total" count for SOPs, so I'm not sure you can get a realistic percentage. Counting the number, may be possible, if difficult, as definitions what exactly constitutes an SOP vary; but percentage, I don't think you can get.
- Indicator 10: I would only measure the % of SEA cases referred and investigated, but not whether there's been disciplinary measures. What we want to measure is whether authorities investigate or not; by only looking at the cases that resulted in disciplinary measures, we exclude those cases that were investigated and dismissed for whatever reason.
- Indicator 9. No. and share of peacekeeper force commander's directives that address measures to protect women and girls, including from sexual violence - Suggestion: insert SRSG to read: No. and share of SRSG and peacekeeper force commander's directives that address measures to protect women and girls, including from sexual violence - Explanation: In keeping with the principle of command responsibility

- For consideration under prevention:
- Decrease in the number of armed security guards and armed private contractors
- Other comments: Generally, the section on Prevention section is not proactive in nature. It is also very SGBV-focused. What about prevention of crisis itself? We also see a structural problem in the way the SC or the UN system as a whole. It does not respond to internal conflicts (e.g. Kenya) nor does it address protracted conflicts (Colombia, Philippines, Sri Lanka). Kenya, for example should be integral to UN efforts because of the role that it could play in early warning. There should be systematic consultations with various stakeholders on broader range of prevention aspects.
- Suggested additional indicator under Protection (and also Prevention): # and % of legislation that help prevent SGBV and protect women and girls' rights "Share of strategic planning frameworks that incorporate gender issues, in conflict-affected countries"
- 'Gender issues' is too broad to use for this particular indicator. Suggestion: "Share of strategic planning frameworks that fully incorporate women's issues, concerns and specific needs in conflict-affected countries"
- 24- need to be detailed –very general
- The main element that seems to be missing from this (and the protection) pillar is - which 'women' are we talking about? And what do we mean when we're talking about SGBV? I think that some others have mentioned this below, and I'm not familiar with some of the larger international SGBV indicators that are mentioned in some of the notes, but I would point out that what really seems to be missing from these accounts is the need to track the multiple forms of oppression that might be responsible for different types of violent acts - that is, disaggregating data according to race/ethnic/religious minorities, LGBTI individuals and communities, and disabled women, here seems critical. I think that this point also goes to the point raised below about 'gender issues' vs 'women's rights' (in the R&R pillar). Although the comments and the need to include the more broadly encompassing 'gender' in order to capture some of these critical intersectional oppressions, where politically feasible.
- I know it is an old question - but how is indicator 9 1.2 going to be enforced?
- Protection and Prevention: I think that the point about paying civil society organizations for the use of their data also comes across in both pillars, particularly since data on SGBV in particular is often collected by women's organizations who run shelters, health clinics, and the like (this point is made directly in 16 1.0). It seems that much of this data collection relies on the unpaid work of CSOs. This particular issue could be addressed by including it in the definition of 18, 2.3 (R&R - 'Allocated and disbursed funding to CSOs')
- Prevention 16, 1.0, 1.1. - again, definitions of GBV should be broadened so that it can include (in contexts where politically feasible) violence against LGBTI persons, disabled women, and race/ethnic/religious minorities.
- 16.2 - This should be removed or a qualifying definition added, as an increase in the number and % of police stations with well resources and operating special women's or family units does not automatically meant that such units are working for the rights of SGBV survivors (For example, a recent study on the rise of such units in Korea found that, instead of helping women to escape abusive partners and criminalizing DV, Korean law has tasked these units with the goal of 'reuniting families'. See MinSook Heo, 'Women's movement and the politics of framing: The construction of anti-domestic violence legislation in South Korea, Women's Studies International Forum, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.wsif.2010.01.005).
- 7. Independence and coverage of monitoring of violations of women and girl's human rights in conflict affected situations by Human Rights Bodies - I was thinking about Mary Ann Arnado's efforts to

monitor a ceasefire and wondered if the indicator couldn't be strengthened by mentioning some type of follow-up mechanism. In other words, it's not just independence and coverage but effective response to violations. So I would suggest that the indicator be a bit more specific and add the other bit, something like "... and civil society organizations, with effective responses following identification of violations" at the end of the current sentence.

- Women seek justice against their assailants

PARTICIPATION

- Indicators on participation should also measure the qualitative aspects of participation. If not, participation indicators will end up measuring token forms of participation! What is required at the very least is further disaggregation and operationalisation of indicators for participation. For example:
 - Indicator 1: 'female uniformed peacekeeping personnel in decision-making positions' (i.e. what ranking?)
 - Indicator 5: '% of eligible women to vote' (what does eligible mean in practice?)
 - Indicator 12: Operational definition of security forces crucial, i.e. disaggregation by ranking, type of function (core vs. supporting functions), civilian vs. non-civilian functions in security forces, disaggregation by different types of security institutions.
- Index of Women's Political Participation in conflict-affected countries, to include:
 - Percentage of women in the judiciary and serving as prosecutors (addition to existing indicator)
- Engagement of survivors of GBV or targeted violence to be included at the table.
- Need provisions for refugee and IDP women!
- Specific mention of female representation in UN decision-making on peace and security related processed in general (**must have!**)
- Gender perspectives and women's participation should be integrated into all SC considerations (not just TOR) and there should also be assessments of completed missions
- Women's participation in security and justice policy reform is just as crucial as their appearance at the peace negotiation table
- Clear definitions of acceptable 'participation levels' will help to avoid tokenism. This indicator would (ideally) ensure that women's input is heard and not just allowed
- There is also a quiet musing surfacing in the few mailings that I have gotten that question whether the pre-security issue involvement of women is considered. If women were not allowed to participate prior to a conflict then these indicators take on a larger meaning than when applied to a location that has already begun involving women. (Not sure what to do with this! Could be scope for an implementation note in an annex? Could be completely off track??)
- I see no where active political engagement of survivors of gender based violence in working actively on policies, etc. Survivors of GBV or other traumas of war must NOT be locked out from active engagement by some kind of administrative gate-keeper. We as visible and politically engaged survivors are not allocated enough monies nor official positions high at the UN to work on 1325 implementation. Why are our experiences and talents under-estimated and under-compensated?
- Meeting decisions/peace agreements considered invalid without at least 40%/40% gender balance amongst the mediators/decision-makers/negotiators?
- Nominations for secondment from Member States to UN senior posts have to have a qualified man's name and a qualified woman's name from which to choose or the nomination is invalid?

- Participation outcome 3 also talks of meaningful participation of women in decision-making processes: Must include qualitative indicator for participation not just counting nos.. E.g: perceptions of women's influence in decision making processes.
- Ind. 2: wording query: substantive consultations with women's groups?
- Participation and/or protection also education and employment - need to include indicators around child care funding and access as few women with childcare responsibilities can actually access education and employment opportunities if they haven't got childcare
- 3rd bullet point - "substantive consultations with women's groups" from conflict-affected communities
- Explanation: The phrase "from conflict-affected communities" is suggested to address the concern of many women's groups in remote and conflict-affected communities that only women's groups based in capital cities or urban centers are consulted during SC missions.
- 4th bullet point "Proportion of negotiating period when women's civil society groups have formal observer status" – Suggestion: replace "observer status" with "consultative status"
- Add one bullet point: Enforce quota system within political parties and reserve seats in elective positions
- For consideration --from the ICAN GNWP indicators on participation:
 - Percentage of women (and their rank) in peacekeeping missions. -This includes both uniformed and civilian personnel.
 - Percentage of IDP/refugee women in IDP/refugee camp management structures.
- Indicator 2 - How is the implementation here being measured? In the 'notes' section it is mentioned that a 'checklist will be completed to assess which gender-related elements have been included in that mission'... I would suggest that this checklist indicate whether these suggestions came from consultations with women's (and other) civil society groups, otherwise I think it is difficult to gauge whether the outcomes of these 'participatory' events have actually had any impact on the final outcome document.
- * Indicator 4 - clear instance of where this can be linked to other sections, showing the interconnectivity of the indicator pillars (as in, many of the 'outcomes' of the peace agreements can be viewed in the following pillars - such as including more). I also agree, as colleagues have stated below, that this indicator should probably be moved to the R&R pillar.
- We should ensure that women's participation is not confused with the inclusion of a gender-perspective - having women present at the table is not necessarily going to guarantee that women's issues are dealt with...
- 4. No. and % of peace agreements with specific gender relevant provisions - Why not insert the word "implemented" (to read "# and % of peace agreements implemented with specific...") since so many peace agreements are incompletely realized?

PROTECTION

- Existence of local rape and sexual violence statutes, and whether the statutes are in conformity with international legal standards (i.e., mandatory affirmative investigation, access to legal representation, protection of witnesses including privacy protections, command responsibility/respondent superior)
- Existence of barriers to reporting and/or prosecution (i.e., medical fees for rape examinations, prosecution for adultery, stigmatization and marginalization from community, statute of limitations, difficult burden of proof, etc.)

- Estimated percentage of woman who fail to report because of such barriers
- Existence of vetting processes to exclude candidates responsible for SGBV crimes
- No. 16 need to have indicator on vulnerability of women in IDP/refugee camps?
- No.17 control over economic resources (Q. on legal control or access?)
- No 12: maybe here there need to be more sectors included? No 12: e.g. what about women's political participation (local, regional, national) ?
- No 16: an example could be whether women visit other villages, attend meetings they've been invited
- No 16: proxies to measures fear e.g. needs to be stronger (women in non-conflict-affected countries may also not like to walk alone at night!)
- No 17: what about subgroups? (widows, single mothers, etc.)
- Key must have: It's important for this pillar to include (as it does in the draft document) reference to participation, as participation and protection are all too often put at odds while they actually reinforce and enable each other!
- An additional impact indicator is the ratio of boys/girls being born, at age 5, 15, 25, etc. to measure the prevalence of selective abortions of female fetuses and the larger impact of malnutrition and/or famine and access to medical care for girls.
- On indicator 16: the 3rd bullet point is really an output indicator and fits better under indicator 13. Also, it's hard to measure whether women's units are "well resourced" or not. In some countries police officers don't even have uniforms or vehicles, so what must a special women's unit have to be "well resourced"? I think the indicator should be whether there is an operating special women's or family unit; I'd be happy with just that.
- Qualitative Indicators: Only one qualitative – proxy for fear (within Ind. 16). There must be more indicators on perceptions e.g. perceptions of safety and security of women;
- Proxies of fear: Do women walk alone at night? More refining perhaps, do women go to market places?
- Protection - maybe amount of funding to frontline service organisations, amount of funding or minimum number of subsidised quality lawyers/advocates expert on women's rights to increase women's access to legal process
- protection - specifically include measures re other crimes against women like honour crimes, FGM and forced marriage which are part of the picture of repression of women's rights and part of early warning and include measures of domestic violence and of trafficking - trafficking always increases in conflict, DV between civil population also increases in both amount and severity
- My comments on the protection indicators focus on indicator number 17. As we know, increasing women's economic security does not mean that they are safer from gender-based violence. For example, women may have access to credit, but may not have control over how that credit is spent. Male family members may psychologically or physically harm a woman who has access to financial resources. Recognizing this, I support measuring women's access to assets, income, and economic resources, but would also suggest measuring their decision-making authority or control over those assets, income, and economic resources. Such as, measuring women's decision-making on household spending.
- Addressing more legislation to impunity for sexual violence
- Mobilizing the justice and health systems in conflict situations

RELIEF AND RECOVERY

- Existence of any amnesty provisions (i.e., in peace agreements, constitutions, domestic legislation, etc.) or other barriers to justice
- Percentage of perpetrators of sexual violence crimes who are investigated and prosecuted out of the total number of perpetrators identified
- Whether a state that has committed an internationally wrongful act is complying with its international legal responsibilities under the ILC Draft Articles on the Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts (i.e., ceasing the act (art. 30(a)), offering guarantees of non-repetition (art. 30(b)), and provision of full reparations (art. 31)).
- Existence of domestic laws ensuring reparations and redress as required for victims of international crimes regardless of prosecutions.
- Indicators 18 and 19: “funding for gender issues” needs to be operationalised, i.e. what counts as a “gender issue”?
- Indicator 20: should also track women’s participation in ad-hoc commissions. This example is indicative of the shortcomings of the pillar structure as it undermines the interdependence of the different components of 1325.
- Indicator 4 (now participation pillar) belongs in the R&R pillar and is an outcome indicator (now marked as impact).
- No. 24 why secondary enrollment rate not completion rate? Attendance rate also important as girls may be enrolled but be kept home more?
- Relief and Recovery outcome 2. refers to transitional justice and outcome 3 to SSR. No indicators have been linked to TJ or SSR.
- No impact indicator for relief and recovery – at least one must be included index indicator.
- Language in Ind. 18, 19, 21 – conflation of gender issues with women’s rights.
- Relief and recovery - something around community work that addresses issues of stigma for women who were formally soldiers and for women who are rape victims - many women don't benefit from DDDR because to benefit from such schemes you have to come forward as having been a soldier and that for women can be very damaging so they'd rather not come forward - hence indicators have to include something around funding, initiatives or attitudes to tackle stigma
- 18. Allocated and disbursed funding to CSOs, including women’s groups, marked for gender issues in conflict affected countries
- I wondered if there shouldn’t be a counterpart indicator beyond funding for civil society organizations that assesses “funding allocated and disbursed by Member States to address gender issues and monitoring to ensure effective impact of these resources”?
- In section f. Towards a Reporting System it seems you would want to include civil society oversight/monitoring data collection beyond UN entities and Member States. Did I miss this?