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INTRODUCTION

The Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017 is legislation that recognizes women as critical to peacemaking and security maintenance, and echoes many of the themes within UN Security Council resolutions. The goals of the law are to promote the use of a gender perspective in understanding security challenges and to increase the participation of women in preventing, managing, and resolving conflict and post-conflict relief and recovery efforts.

The Global Fragility Act (GFA), passed by Congress with bipartisan support and signed into law by President Trump on December 20, 2019, will create the first-ever comprehensive US government strategy to tackle and prevent global conflict. The GFA mandates the development of a Global Fragility Strategy (GFS) to ensure that relevant US agencies—diplomacy, development, and defense—collaborate in order to effectively prevent and reduce violence in at least five identified fragile countries over a period of ten years.

An effective human security policy agenda requires the successful implementation of the WPS Act and a critical push for meaningful gender-informed implementation through the GFA. It is important for the WPS Act to be integrated into GFA strategy and subsequent country and regional plans because women and girls are disproportionately impacted by fragility and conflict—and are often an overlooked part of stability solutions.

Background on the Consultations with Civil Society

Our Secure Future, in partnership with the Alliance for Peacebuilding, the Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security, and the McCain Institute, organized a series of consultations with civil society groups and officials from the US Government in July and August 2020. The first consultation, “Tools for Advancing Gender Integration into GFA Country Strategies,” featured presentations from the International Republican Institute (IRI), Saferworld, and Counterpart International. The second consultation, “Indicators and Metrics,” featured the Alliance for Peacebuilding, Mercy Corps, Miki Jacevic, Smash Strategies, and the United States Institute of Peace (USIP). Our Secure Future also circulated surveys to solicit feedback from civil society representatives who did not participate in the consultations.

Consultations with civil society groups are not only critical, but are required by the GFA. Section 504(b) of the GFA mandates that there be a stakeholder consultation process with representatives of civil society, including “international development organizations with experience implementing programs in fragile states” and civic entities in countries and regions where the GFS is likely to be implemented.

The goal of this series of consultations held from July through August 2020 was to review lessons learned and best practices for gender integration into programming, policy, and learning and evaluation to ensure a gendered perspective is incorporated into the GFS and the ten-year country and regional plans.
KEY FINDINGS

This brief provides a summary of key recommendations from civil society on how to integrate gender into the GFS. It is critical that the GFA country and regional plans go beyond the individual empowerment of women in a society and aim to transform the societal power structures that fuel instability and inequality.

Tools for Advancing Gender Integration into GFA Country Strategies

(Consultation 1)

During this consultation, civil society groups shared their most pertinent tools for integrating gender programming that could be used during the development of the GFS and the ten-year country and regional plans. This includes the use of gender analysis, harmonization with the US Strategy on WPS and other countries’ National Action Plans on WPS, consultations with women’s civil society groups, and other possible ideas, such as integration of GFA objectives into shadow reporting of in-country 1325 coalitions.

Key Recommendations

- **ENHANCE WOMEN’S AND GIRLS’ PARTICIPATION** by establishing equal partnerships with women-led or women’s rights organizations through conducting meaningful consultations. These consultations should be regular, even quarterly, in order to better relations, and can become more of an on-going conversation and less of a confrontation.

- **CONDUCT GENDER-SENSITIVE CONFLICT ANALYSIS** to understand the gender norms operating in the context and the gendered impacts and drivers of conflict, and address a broad definition of violence and its effects on long-term community stability.

- **PROMOTE INTERGOVERNMENTAL ENGAGEMENT AND COORDINATION**, leveraging engagement with both national and local government actors in order to increase the likelihood that national policies will be effectively implemented in local communities.

- **FACILITATE INTERNAL GENDER EXPERTISE AND GENDER TRAINING**, including at leadership levels, particularly by emphasizing the critical role men must play in promoting gender equality within societal stability.

- **PROVIDE DEDICATED AND TRANSPARENT FUNDING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF WPS COMMITMENTS IN ALL ACTIVITIES**, as well as direct funding to women-led and women’s rights organizations.

- **INCLUDE AN INTERSECTIONAL PERSPECTIVE IN ALL WORK**, including intentional engagement with young women as part of youth programming.

RESOURCES ON GENDER INTEGRATION

**Saferworld**

The *Gender Analysis of Conflict Toolkit* is intended to help national and international non-governmental organizations and other peacebuilding practitioners integrate gender perspectives into conflict analysis, providing a foundation for more gender-sensitive peacebuilding programs. This toolkit focuses on how gender norms—the ways in which societies pressure their male and female members to behave—can either drive conflict and insecurity or be resources for peace.

**Beyond Consultations** supports actors to self-assess the extent to which their current consultation practices, large or small, meaningfully engage women in fragile and conflict-affected states (FCAS). This tool provides a best-practice framework to support actors to improve their practice, moving beyond extractive or tokenistic consultations towards meaningful dialogues with women and women’s organizations in FCAS, and to ensure that women and women’s organizations are fully engaged with decision-making processes.

**International Republican Institute (IRI)**

The *Gender-Responsive Policymaking Handbook* was designed as a reference guide for government and civil society actors alike on how to integrate gender considerations into each phase of the policymaking process in order to promote more democratic, equitable and resilient societies. The handbook summarizes key terms and concepts and provides a step-by-step approach on how to effectively address the needs and priorities of women and girls through their meaningful participation. The content is based on the “Gender-Responsive Policymaking Toolkit,” a training curriculum developed by the IRI’s Women’s Democracy Network. Both resources are available in English, French, Spanish and Arabic.

**International Civil Society Action Network (ICAN)**

The *Better Peace Initiative* tool explores the history and evolution of peacemaking in modern times. It considers six common barriers to inclusion and how to overcome them. Additionally, it presents a four-part framework for the inclusion of women peacebuilders, offering proactive steps to broaden participation. The Better Peace Initiative is available in English, Arabic, French, Russian, Tamil, Sinhala, Urdu, Spanish, Portuguese, Myanmar, and Thai.
Metrics and Indicators (Consultation 2)

The second consultation addressed the challenges and successes in monitoring and evaluating (M&E) gender integration into programming and how the USG can best work with international and local civil society on data collection, analysis, monitoring, evaluation, and learning.

**Key Recommendations**

- **M&E MUST BE A CRITICAL COMPONENT OF DESIGN FROM THE BEGINNING,** with effective sampling and targeting methods in place in order to conduct more in-depth analyses on various subsets. It will be critical to conduct periodic gender assessments to reinforce gender objectives as they were developed in the gender and inclusion strategy from the start.

- **INVEST AGGRESSIVELY IN FOUNDATIONAL M&E CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT** including both interagency capacity and women-led grassroots patterns, to effectively implement and measure indicators of WPS plans.

- **COORDINATE A NARROW RESEARCH AGENDA** (2-3 research and learning targets, limiting total indicators and adding qualitative factors) to guarantee collection of sufficient, rigorous data that will answer the key questions for the GFA.

- **SUPPORT INCLUSIVE RESEARCH APPROACHES AND ANALYSES, MOVING FROM MEASURING OUTPUTS TO MEASURING OUTCOMES** that are relevant to scope, with disaggregated data, including indicators encompassing gender, ethnicity, age and/or other marginalized identities.

- **PURSUE ACTIVITIES THAT SUPPORT THE INCLUSION OF WOMEN IN FORMAL AND INFORMAL PEACE AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES** at the local/community, state and national levels. For example, enhancing and supporting women’s networks can help to promote their inclusion in decision-making processes.

- **DEVELOP A GENDER-SENSITIVE APPROACH TO M&E,** which will require strengthening institutional and individual capacity to undertake gender mainstreaming in programs. Gendered metrics require gender mainstreaming across all programming.

- **NATIONAL ACTION PLANS (NAPS) AND FUNDING LEVELS ARE GOOD INDICATORS OF HOW GENDER IS INTERPRETED AT THE COUNTRY-LEVEL** and provide insight into intervention, as some have robust M&E plans.

- **OPERATIONAL PLANS THAT ALREADY EXIST MUST BE USED TO SEE WHAT SYSTEMS ARE IN PLACE;** map the current reporting by the US regarding international obligations; recognize the resources needed for effective monitoring of quantitative and qualitative indicators and plan for the human, technical and financial needs; centralize the monitoring by a specific entity; coordinate what information will be shared, by whom, and how they will share it; and understand what the narrative arc can contribute to change the system for better gender mainstreaming across all programing.

---

**RESOURCES ON GENDER-SENSITIVE METRICS**

Mercy Corps

*Community Initiatives to Promote Peace: Gender Assessment Methodology*

Community Initiatives to Promote Peace (CIPP) is a conflict-management and peacebuilding program funded by USAID with Mercy Corps Nigeria as a lead implementer. One of the goals is to “deepen engagement of women in peacebuilding and preventing violent extremism.” A gender needs assessment was carried out across all project stages to better understand the underlying factors affecting meaningful participation of socially marginalized groups, including girls and women, in the peacebuilding process. Conducting the assessment provided strategic direction to the CIPP program to integrate gender across all program strategies and activities.

Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security

Women are largely absent from formal, Track I diplomatic processes, but are far more involved in informal, Track II peace processes. *Tracking Women’s Participation in Informal Peace Processes* is an inventory of informal peace processes with women’s involvement, and is available as a PDF and an Excel spreadsheet. It covers the period from 1991–2017 for concluded peace agreements, alongside several ongoing peace processes, and is the first comprehensive attempt to map women’s informal efforts to secure peace. A full discussion of the data, methods, and findings appears in Anjali Kaushlesh Dayal and Agathe Christien’s 2020 journal article, “Women’s Participation in Informal Peace Processes,” in Global Governance. A summary of their findings is available in this policy brief.

Alliance for Peacebuilding

The *Eirene Peacebuilding Database* is the culmination of nearly two years of work to search, catalogue, curate, and share peacebuilding key indicators that will help better assess work and measure impact. It puts forward program approaches, indicators, and measures currently being used in peacebuilding across seven program areas: Dispute Resolution, Governance, Perceptions of Safety & Security, Resilience, Trust, Social Cohesion, and Violence Reduction.
CIVIL SOCIETY CASE STUDIES

Here are five examples of different forms of government that characterize fragile states. There is a mix of general scenarios and specific country examples. The examples come from a survey of a broad range of civil society actors involved in both WPS- and GFA-related projects and programs globally conducted by the Alliance for Peacebuilding and Our Secure Future in August 2020. This section includes direct quotes that have been edited for clarity.

Example A
An authoritarian regime with a stable government and weak civil society (Egypt)

An authoritarian regime with a stable government will ensure that civil society remains weak and under continuous state surveillance. Civil society will be a puppet to be used to spread the regime’s propaganda. Opportunities for women-led civil society organizations to enhance their capacities—such as being offered trainings and capacity-building skills by regional or international organizations—will be met with crackdowns and closures. In particular, women and men are vulnerable to sexual and gender based violence that curb their political activity. Hence, while the authoritarian regime may seem to coexist with the civil society in their country, they will resist, even by force, any trajectory towards democratization.

Example B
An authoritarian regime with a fragile government and a strong civil society (general example)

If the authoritarian regime is to allow the civil society to work, they will, however, not allow them to work freely, and will constantly repress them. The regime will do what it takes to ensure that the civil society groups do not receive any resources. Hence, all donations will have to go through government censorship. The authoritarian regime will give itself the authority to crack down and criminalize civil society, which will not stop its activism, even if it is to go underground.

Example C
A democratic but fragile state with a strong civil society (Lebanon)

A strong civil society is capable of ensuring that the state strongly commits to human rights principles, including women’s rights. This is especially the case if the authority is democratic, even if the state is fragile. In fact, the state will assist in the development and implementation of work plans and strategies to advance women’s status in the country. For example, “The endorsement by the Government of Lebanon of a National Action Plan for the implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security demonstrates the Government’s serious political will to support women’s participation in decision-making, to amend unfair laws they face, and to protect them from the violence they may be subjected to. The initiatives included in this plan will help women overcome the difficulties they face during conflicts and participate in efforts to prevent such situations. With this decision, public administrations are committed to working, hand in hand, with commissions and organizations that support women in order to promote the status of women in society and to eliminate all forms of discrimination they endure. It is a qualitative step that Lebanon is taking towards greater cohesion in society.” —Survey respondent from the National Commission for Lebanese Women

Example D
A democratic but fragile state with a weak civil society (Iraq)

A democratic but fragile state with a weak civil society will not be able to well integrate gender and a WPS-NAP, even if it has already developed one. In Iraq, e.g., the challenges faced in the implementation of the WPS-NAP are mainly a result of widespread militia and the continuous ethnic and sectarian conflict in the conservative society. It is also due to the geopolitical unstable status in the region being exacerbated by the refugee and internally displaced persons (IDP) crisis. All these factors have challenged the reconstruction of the post-war governance system in general, including efforts to empower women, implement the WPS-NAP, and promote women to leadership positions, as they are met with continuous resistance. Furthermore, because of the above mentioned challenges, including lack of financial means, little support is provided to the WPS Cross-Sector Task Force (CSTF) to implement the agenda. Hence, the CSTF faced limitations related to capacities and technical skills; lack of implementation tools including mid-term review and follow-up. The data was missing or difficult to find, which indicates challenges in data collection and management systems. The monitoring of progress has been even more difficult in the absence of a monitoring body within the CSTF.

Example E
Fragile states in political transition with growing violent extremism (East Africa)

Predominantly male authoritarian regimes, like in Sudan and Libya, will push back women’s participation in any public events, especially political participation. There is significant resistance to allow the minimum 30 percent of women’s participation in leadership and decision-making posts.
Search for Common Ground sent out a few questions to their teams, and many in East Africa shared the following recommendations:

- Understand the importance of unpacking some of the terms and concepts we are targeting and what they mean to different people by gender and age. For example: what is “security” for young women as compared to young men, to older women, as well as women in positions of power? Inequitable gender dynamics affect all women in different ways, including hampering meaningful engagement in decision-making processes.

- Subtle gender norms—that we don’t necessarily acknowledge or even realize exist—can affect group dynamics and people’s approaches. For example, in conversations during the gender session in Kigali, it was shared that men make a point and stick with it, even if most are thinking otherwise. Women disagree more subtly/indirectly. It is important to consider how these different dynamics may go unnoticed and how they affect our discussions and outcomes, even in relatively basic ways.

- The Kenya team organized a male and female-only activity to understand what peace and security means to the different groups. The female-only activity opened up new realities for the programming team as the ladies discussed issues affecting them that had not been previously considered.

- It is important to ensure that resources target specific localized actions and are available to local community groups. While engaging with women in extremely remote areas, we have learned that many will not participate when activities are conducted past their locality. Case in point, due to increased security infrastructure—roadblocks and security forces on the ground—women from different coastal areas of Kenya have to go through checkpoints. This requires them to produce identification papers that they don’t have, as well as go through several searches that are intimidating.

- Ensure that there are strong gender and inclusion components in the training curriculum and other activity components, such as ongoing dialogues, as well as ideas and components that promote positive masculinity. Target senior officers who make decisions on deployment to change their attitudes with gender and security training. Engage with them to be intentional about not only deploying female officers, but also encouraging them to take up assignments that would “normally” have more men.

### INTERSECTIONALITY:
**THE WOMEN, PEACE & SECURITY ACT AND THE GLOBAL FRAGILITY ACT**

It is critical that the Women, Peace and Security agenda, as outlined in the WPS National Strategy and the WPS Act (2017), informs the Global Fragility Act. The Global Fragility Strategy Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of USAID, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and heads of other relevant agencies, are mandated to create a ten-year “Global Fragility Strategy” to stabilize conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally. It requires consultation with local civil society organizations, international development organizations, multilateral organizations, donors, and other relevant organizations.

**GFA and WPS Implementation:**

No later than 270 days after passage of the Global Fragility Act, these agencies have to submit a report to Congress on the status of the Global Fragility Strategy (GFS) as well as country and region selection. WPS implementation plans for each agency can be referenced for content and metrics to inform the GFS.

**Selection of Priority Countries for both the GFA and WPS requirements:**

At least five countries or priority regions will be selected for Global Fragility Strategy implementation. Country selection will be based on level of violence or fragility as ranked by the lists of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Fund for Peace Index, World Bank, Institute for Economics and Peace, and US Holocaust Memorial Museum, as well as the USG conflict and atrocities list. Countries that have robust National Action Plans on Women, Peace and Security and which need additional resources for implementation (from political will to funding) should be considered.

**Ten-year GFA Country and Regional Plans:**

No later than one year after the Global Fragility Act becomes law, the administration has to provide ten-year country- and/or region-specific plans to align and integrate GFS activities, including diplomatic, development, and security assistance, and other relevant activities with respect to each country or region.
### TABLE 1. CROSS-REFERENCING GFA REQUIREMENTS WITH WPS REQUIREMENTS

This table shows the connections between the requirements of the GFA and the WPS Act and the Lines of Effort (LOEs) and Indicators from WPS implementation plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the GFA Requires</th>
<th>Cross-reference with existing WPS implementation plans and WPS National Action Plans</th>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation: Cross-reference the WPS LOEs and Indicators with GFA Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Specific multi-year interagency plans for coordination and implementation</td>
<td>1. For the US, the best documents to use are the US WPS Agency Implementation Plans.</td>
<td>1. Look up the US WPS Implementation Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goals and objectives for stabilization for each country</td>
<td>2. For the GFA countries, the best place to look is at National Action Plans on Women, Peace and Security.</td>
<td>2. WPS has 4 Lines of Effort (LOEs):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integration of these goals into general US country plans and strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOE 1: Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment, Monitoring, Evaluation; how planning and implementation will be coordinated</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOE 2: Protection &amp; Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional impact (in case of priority country)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOE 3: Internal US Capabilities (USG Training, e.g.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-country–level factors (in case of priority region)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOE 4: Partner Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOE 4: Partner Support corresponds the most to the objectives regarding multi-country strategies and impact. For example:

- **USAID WPS Indicator 4.1**
  Number of partner nation legal instruments and policies drafted—including national-level frameworks on WPS and GBV response—that are developed or implemented with assistance or encouragement from U.S. actors.

- **Indicator 4.3**
  Number of engagements by key U.S. leaders that lead to formal partnerships on WPS with partner nations.

- **DOS LOE 4**
  WPS 4.1-1 Number of countries that develop, revise, or implement National Action Plans on WPS with U.S. diplomatic or programmatic support.
  WPS 4.1-2 Number of countries that integrate WPS concepts into their CVE policy frameworks with U.S. diplomatic or programmatic support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What the GFA Requires</th>
<th>Cross-reference with existing WPS implementation plans and WPS National Action Plans</th>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation: Cross-reference the WPS LOEs and Indicators with GFA Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Dedicates $1.15 billion over the next five years for conflict prevention and peacebuilding in countries at risk of violence and conflict.</td>
<td>• Provide dedicated and transparent funding for implementation of WPS commitments in all activities, as well as direct funding to women-led and women’s rights organizations.</td>
<td>Example indicators from the USAID WPS Implementation Plan that could be used to track the intersection of GFA and WPS funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LOE 1: Participation USAID Indicator WPS 1.1.3 Number of women who participate in US-funded training for foreign nationals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LOE 2: Protection USAID Indicator WPS 2.2.4 Percentage of USG-funded projects with NGOs and international organizations that include activities to prevent and/or respond to GBV in humanitarian emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LOE 3: Partnerships USAID Indicator WPS 3.4-1 Total USAID funding attributed to the WPS key issues in the annual Operational Plan (agency-wide).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consideration of how appropriate local actors, including organizations led by women, youth, and under-represented communities, have an appropriate ownership stake.</td>
<td>• Enhance women and girls’ participation by establishing equal partnerships with women-led or women’s rights organizations through conducting meaningful consultations. These consultations should be regular, even quarterly, in order to better relations, and can become more of a conversation and less of a confrontation.</td>
<td>• LOE 1: Participation USAID Indicator WPS 1.2 Number of local women who participate in substantive roles or positions influencing peace efforts, both formal and informal, in which the US is involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DOS Metric: Number of local women who participate in substantive roles or positions influencing peace efforts, both formal and informal, in which the United States is involved. (Reporting departments or agencies: State and USAID.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GFA Requirement:
- The GFA requires a baseline analysis of the fragile state.

### Cross-reference with existing WPS implementation plans and WPS National Action Plans
- **Include a gender analysis per the WPS Act of 2017**
  - When taking a baseline analysis for each GFA country, and
  - when developing security assistance goals, **cross-reference host country NAPS on WPS; make sure to consult and include local women’s organizations.**

### Monitoring and Evaluation: Cross-reference the WPS LOEs and Indicators with GFA Indicators
- **Matching indicator from the DoD WPS Plan:**
  - Immediate Defense Objective 2.1: DoD support for women’s meaningful participation within partner nation defense and security sectors.
  - Effect 2.1.1 **Partner nation women have increased access to and participation in US security cooperation and assistance programs, resources, training and education opportunities.**

**LOE 3**
- **DOS Metric:** Number of U.S. strategies, policies, and programs are informed by a gender analysis. (Reporting departments or agencies: State, USAID, DOD, and DHS.)
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