

A Roundtable Discussion on Women, Peace and Security

MEETING REPORT



1 August 2011
The Rockefeller Foundation, New York City

“Catalyzing efforts to both strengthen the security of women and also to bolster women’s leadership in preventing conflict and building peace is real and absolutely fundamental to the future of humanity.”

Judith Rodin, President, The Rockefeller Foundation

Contact Information:

Jennifer F. Klot, Senior Adviser, Social Science Research Council
Telephone: (212) 377-2700
klot@ssrc.org

CONTENTS

<u>I. INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>II. CREATING A VISION, BUILDING A FIELD</u>	<u>3</u>
ORIGINS OF AN AGENDA: SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1325	3
INCREASING WOMEN’S SECURITY, PROTECTING RIGHTS, ENSURING JUSTICE	4
<u>III. LISTENING TO WOMEN</u>	<u>5</u>
STRENGTHENING WOMEN’S LEADERSHIP	6
BUILDING WOMEN’S INSTITUTIONS AND NETWORKS	7
<u>IV. BUILDING THE EVIDENCE BASE</u>	<u>7</u>
WHOSE KNOWLEDGE, WHOSE NEEDS?	8
KNOWING WHAT WORKS, WHAT DOESN’T AND WHY	9
<u>V. CREATING A FUNDING COMMUNITY</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>VI. ESTABLISHING AN AGENDA, BUILDING A FIELD: NEXT STEPS</u>	<u>11</u>
IDENTIFYING FUNDING PATTERNS AND TRENDS	12
CREATING AFFINITY	13
ASSESSING KNOWLEDGE NEEDS AND GAPS	13
<u>VII. CONCLUSION</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>16</u>

I. INTRODUCTION

A Roundtable Discussion on Women, Peace and Security was convened by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and hosted by The Rockefeller Foundation on 1 August 2011. The meeting brought together 45 foundation leaders, experts, practitioners and policymakers from across the United States (US) and Canada to discuss strategies for strengthening the impact of grantmaking for peace and security. The Roundtable's twofold aim was to explore ways of (1) making the gender dimensions of peace and security an explicit aspect of the philanthropic dialogue and (2) building a funding community that can both contribute to, and be informed by, an emerging field of research, practice and activism.

The Rockefeller Foundation's engagement in the meeting drew from its longstanding partnership with the SSRC and from its commitment to gender issues and support for collaborations and networks seeking actionable solutions by strengthening policy and research linkages.¹ The Roundtable was organized in the context of an SSRC initiative, supported by the Oak Foundation, to map US grantmaking on women and peacebuilding.² Beginning with a desk review of more than 200 donors, the Roundtable agenda was developed through discussions with some sixty senior funders about their grantmaking priorities and strategies. Roundtable participants included foundations with dedicated programs on gender and security, such as the Open Society Foundations and the Channel Foundation, as well as public and operating foundations, such as the African Women's Development Fund, the Global Fund for Women and the Hunt Alternatives Fund. Relevant foundations were also identified by the Peace and Security Funders Group (PSFG),³ the International Human Rights Funders Group (IHRFG) and Grantmakers Without Borders (GWOB).

II. CREATING A VISION, BUILDING A FIELD

What are the most crucial priorities for women affected by armed conflict? And where is the imagination to see beyond 1325? What would a more holistic agenda look like? Are we even asking the right questions? How can the parameters be reset?

Carol Cohn, Director, Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights

Origins of an Agenda: Security Council Resolution 1325

The 'women, peace and security' agenda has its origins in the United Nations (UN) Security Council's first ever resolution on women, Resolution 1325. Adopted in 2000, it had taken the UN Security Council more than fifty years to recognize the relevance of women and gender issues to the maintenance of international peace and security. Resolution 1325 is now the most widely cited international security policy to address gender issues and probably the most influential in defining this emergent field of research, practice and activism.⁴

¹ The SSRC was founded in 1923 by the wife of John D. Rockefeller, Laura Spellman.

² This mapping was originally intended to identify ways in which a new International Centre on Gender, Peace and Security (ICGPS) that is being incubated by the SSRC with initial funding from UNDP and UN Women, could serve as a resource to US foundations. See www.c-gps.org for additional information about the Centre.

³ The PSFG had already begun to assess its members' grantmaking on gender and expanded its survey to include all of those who expressed an interest in participating in the Roundtable.

⁴ There is much to be said (elsewhere) about the historical, activist and intellectual and multilateral context in which this emerged, in relation to women's peace activism, the women's human rights movement, the UN's evolving peace building architecture and institutional arrangements for women.

ADVANCING THE AGENDA ON WOMEN, PEACE AND SECURITY

FIVE MISCONCEPTIONS

- 1. TALK LEADS TO ACTION:** When faced with inaction we ratchet up the talk. 1325 is truly a beautiful resolution that lays out principles, suggests actions, and assigns responsibilities in the UN system and provides a license to act. We have summits on resolutions, we issue more publications about projects, but we tend not to just want to look at the problem straight in the face which is that talk simply doesn't lead to action.
- 2. ACCESS LEADS TO INFLUENCE:** Although we have seen a growing representation of women in some provisional authorities in post-conflict countries and in some peacekeeping efforts, there is no guarantee that women's presence will influence political processes, policy reforms or social and cultural traditions. Absent the support, capacity development and networking opportunities that men have had for decades, access to the 'table' may do little to advance gender equality.
- 3. INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT WILL LEAD TO SYSTEMIC CHANGE:** We are so desperate for good news that one woman minister, or president, leads us to the edge of euphoria, and we start to think that the trend is turning and that this indicates real significant change. The problem is that isolated cases of individual achievement are just that: inspiring examples of individual women who have overcome adversity. But they do not mean that the tide is turning. Concurrently, there needs to be a critical mass of empowered women in all sectors, rather than a small number.
- 4. ONE ENLIGHTENED STATE (OR LEADER) CAN MAKE THE DIFFERENCE:** In fragile and conflict-affected states, there is little evidence that any single government leader or legislative reform can create the social, cultural and behavioral changes needed to advance gender equality. Rhetorical commitment to gender equality by governments in conflict-affected states is necessary but insufficient to bring about long-term, sustainable change.
- 5. OUR INSTINCTS OUTWEIGH THE NEED FOR EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE, RESEARCH AND DATA ABOUT WHAT WORKS:** There is very little data or empirical evidence to demonstrate that mainstream approaches to gender equality in conflict situations are having any impact. Often adapted from western models of democratic governance, we have yet to see that more women in political positions in conflict-affected and fragile states will advance gender equality; that legislative reforms will reduce sexual violence or that micro credit will address structural inequalities.

KATHLEEN CRAVERO, PRESIDENT, OAK FOUNDATION

Resolution 1325 mandates the consideration of gender issues in all international interventions to build peace and resolve conflicts. In prescribing concrete actions, it made the gender dimensions of 'human security' both tangible and measurable, while creating new opportunities to leverage resources and develop new intellectual and policy agendas. Carol Cohn described how this watershed Resolution was both driven by, and significant in, shaping a veritable movement of activism which came from "outrage about what happens to women during and in the aftermath of conflict and ... also from women's exclusion from peace processes." Ten years after its adoption, however, assessments of implementation are bleak. Kathleen Cravero, President of the Oak Foundation and former United Nations Assistant Secretary General, suggested that the failure of UN strategies to mobilize real transformative change for women affected by conflict stemmed from five fundamental misconceptions about the Resolution and about the factors that are most significant in advancing gender equality (see box).

Increasing Women's Security, Protecting Rights, Ensuring Justice

In [the US], justice is individualistic. Elsewhere, when communities of women are targeted, they will generally ask for reparations for the community. That says a lot about the role of the women in maintaining the sense of community. Many kinds of justice are needed to address the larger causes of warfare or rape, such as restorative or community justice that take a look at larger problems of what went wrong and how to put it right.

Maryam Elahi, Director, International Women's Program, Open Society Foundations

Although women and gender issues have been made explicit in the context of the UN's peace and security agenda, outside of the multilateral arena, they have no equivalent identity as a field of research, practice, activism or funding. The absence of academic programs and research on gender and crisis is pervasive within well-resourced academic institutions in the global north, and the situation is even more challenging in the global south. And activism in the US on security issues – from nuclear proliferation to genocide – often neglect a focus on women or the gender dimensions of security policy.

"Obviously, access to rule of law is important but it has not led to a decrease in sexual violence. ... We need the courage to confront the reality that some of the strategies being supported by the international community simply are not working. ... Women are tired of being asked to talk solely about sexual violence which is only one symptom of a larger problem. It is crucial that we address all forms of violence and women's security risks and needs before, during and after conflicts take place."

Theo Sowa, Interim CEO
African Women's Development Fund

Building on a long and successful tradition of women's human rights activism and scholarship, there has been some coalescence of funding, research and activism to advance women's leadership and access to justice in conflict-affected areas, especially in relation to sexual violence. Yet despite progress made in strengthening international norms and standards, the risks to women's lives during conflict and its aftermath have not diminished and, for many, have become far worse. Violence against women affects their families and communities and therefore requires a more inclusive approach to justice that goes beyond individual remedies. Karen Colvard, Director of Programs at the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, pointed to the need for more inclusive approaches, such as restorative and community justice, that also address the larger causes of warfare or sexual violence.

"The focus on violence against women as a weapon of war has helped advance the broader women, peace, and security agenda," said

Pamela Shifman, Director of Initiatives for Girls and Women at the Novo Foundation, "but we also need to examine how violence against girls and women in times of peace is linked to conflict-related violence. The analysis of power and the unequal status of women cannot be forgotten as we develop an understanding of conflict-related gender based violence." One conclusion that was reached during the discussion: theory is simply not meeting the needs of people actually experiencing these realities.

III. LISTENING TO WOMEN

We need to build support systems for women when they enter leadership positions. ... There will be a crisis if women feel like they haven't been heard, and then they will stop engaging. We need to focus on peacebuilders rather than perpetrators. Right now, those who make the most trouble get the most attention and this especially marginalizes women.

Charlotte Bunch, Founding Director and Senior Scholar, Center for Women's Global Leadership

"Listen to the women," said Josie Hadden, Executive Director of Terrafocus, "we really need to talk to women on the ground and amplify their voices." This mantra of wisdom carried throughout the day. While recognizing that there is no single 'woman's perspective' and that many other factors will

influence how and whose perspective is given visibility, far too little investment has been made in listening to those most affected by conflict. “How do we amplify local voices with only limited connections to local groups?” asked David Abramowitz, Vice President of Policy and Government Relations for Humanity United, “there needs to be a range of capacity building efforts to strengthen women’s leadership. Much more momentum is needed on this issue and clear opportunities and spaces for collaboration.”

The power, agency and experience-based knowledge among women and those most affected by crises must be valued better, and used to inform the development of a substantive ‘gender agenda’ around which expertise and constituencies can be mobilized. Space must be created and careful attention given to how these agendas are framed from above and below – by international institutions and local women’s movements – and to the processes through which they are negotiated. The different and sometimes competing priorities among local women’s groups, national and international movements for democracy and women’s rights must also be recognized in relation to the opportunities and challenges for strengthening solidarity and aligning the ‘gender and security’ discourse across constituencies and regions of the world.

Strengthening Women’s Leadership

What impact does women’s representation in decision-making have on different aspects of the ‘gender agenda’? It is not just getting women at the peace table, or getting them elected.... Until the legal system changes, cultural norms are tackled, partnerships are established and grassroots actors are empowered, gender equality will not be fully realized.

Jordan Ryan, UNDP Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery

Women leaders living and working in insecure environments need safe spaces, time and support so that they can reflect on and document their own experiences, strategize, teach others and learn from them. Increasing the impact of women leaders will certainly require skills training, networking opportunities and mentoring. But the overall impact of women’s leadership on gender equality will be shaped by many factors that go beyond their individual abilities. Strategies to advance women’s leadership must be holistic and consider the socio-cultural, educational and economic challenges that often constrain their participation in public life. They must also take into account the constraints associated with different types of political systems (e.g. selection and decision-making processes) and the enabling environment (e.g. from intellectual freedom to safe transportation that allows women to even attend meetings). For Susan Braden, Senior Policy Advisor in the Office of Global Women’s Issues at the US Department of State, “the greatest challenge is convincing people that women can have an impact on security – getting them to see that helping women is not just a nice thing to do, but a strategy to help the overall development of the country. ... You can’t just focus on protection, you need to make the connection between participation and protection. ... I think people are beginning to accept that a lack of protection of women can affect overall security.”

Women’s ability to lead effectively will also depend on the support they receive from their families and communities and especially the perspective of male colleagues, family and community members regarding their public roles. This, in turn, means addressing socio-cultural factors. “I believe that cultural change is even more important than political change,” said Josie Hadden, “if gender is always us versus them, men will push back. We need to address the men’s issues as well, and consider why the circumstances exist. Change doesn’t happen on just one side.”

Building Women's Institutions and Networks

Effective leadership to advance gender equality requires strong institutions and networks that can provide support, resources, knowledge and access to relevant constituencies and decision-making arenas. Yet there are very few independent institutions that focus exclusively on issues relating to women, peace and security – nationally, regionally or internationally. Many women's organizations are completely unknown to donors or they are too small to apply for multi-or bilateral funds. Or, their capacity may be too weak to identify funding opportunities or present strong proposals. Smaller foundations typically do not have the resources, contacts or reach to identify local partners and monitor their work over time. Said Katrin Wilde, Executive Director of the Channel Foundation, "One of the biggest challenges is that most of these women's groups are off the radar. We've supported work on the implementation of 1325 and most of these groups are not even aware of 1325. How can a smaller funder make a difference, and make small grants to small grassroots groups?"

Although women activists, policymakers and practitioners from conflict-affected areas want to learn from the experiences of their counterparts within their own regions, they find few opportunities to network and travel outside of invitations to events in the 'north' and have little funding to build alliances within and outside of their political parties and among their constituencies. From Afghanistan and Burundi, to Kosovo and Bosnia, local women's movements have questioned the legitimacy of women leaders that have been buoyed into public roles through their connections with international and elite women's networks. They have also been accused of representing 'western,' 'neo-liberal' and 'feminist' agendas; experienced isolation; and even received security threats by colleagues within their own parties. In other cases, international organizations have been viewed as competitors with local institutions in vying for international and bilateral funds to advance gender equality.

As an activist agenda, strengthening women's civil society movements is especially important in fragile and conflict-affected states where democracy may have to be built from the ground up. Women's organizations need core support to ensure their long-term sustainability and shape their own intellectual and policy agendas. New mechanisms and strategies are needed to increase the synergy across grantmakers, international organizations and their southern partners to respond to what may be competing priorities, both among and between 'local actors' and international donors, as well as within women's movements – locally, regionally, globally.

IV. BUILDING THE EVIDENCE BASE

As scholars, we focus too narrowly on our own areas and work in silos. We must go beyond our disciplines to understand others and know where to place women's issues. To challenge the established framework, you cannot change what you don't know, and you need others to help you get there.

Funmi Olonisakin, Director, African Leadership Centre

Peacebuilding is a relatively new field of research and practice. Even among those willing to think strategically about gender and security, there is very little empirical or operational research on which to base policy or strengthen programs. Sex and age disaggregated data and gender analysis are absent from the most widely used international survey instruments and indices of state fragility, peace, governance, natural disasters, humanitarian response and post-conflict needs assessments. Although a much larger stock of 'grey' literature prevails in the form of policy notes, guidelines, toolkits, anecdotal and descriptive accounts; the absence of empirical, comparative and longitudinal data has made it virtually impossible to take an evidence-based approach to peacebuilding. And available data – in relation to the proportion of women in parliament, the ratio of girls enrolled in primary school or the

legal framework for protecting women's rights – reveal very little about the causes of gender inequality or the most effective opportunities for response.

Whose Knowledge, Whose Needs?

Knowledge needs and gaps vary across constituencies, from those directly affected by crises to the architects of peacebuilding interventions. An IDRC survey found that even though gender ranks high among the issues about which think tanks, the policy community, NGOs, the media and international organizations want information; it is also considered the most inaccessible. The dearth of publications on gender and security in Arabic, Spanish, French and Portuguese is especially pronounced and further limits knowledge sharing and learning within and across the global south and north. Although research is among the largest funding categories within US grantmaking for peace and security – some half of \$250 million in 2008-2009 – resources are concentrated among a handful of elite research institutions and universities.⁵ Nor has gender been a significant emphasis in the largest funding areas: controlling and eliminating weaponry and preventing and resolving violent conflict. “In 2011, it is still a struggle to find [gender expertise] at think tanks” said Sarah Mendelson, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance at the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), “We need to grow a new generation of scholars who are funded to look at these issues and will inhabit them.”

“How deeply do we as a funder want, or are able, to go into particular problems? Do we support band-aids that can have real impacts but don’t offer fundamental solutions, or do we get to some of the underlying, deeper structural impacts but that also might require more conceptual, theoretical work?”

Sue Szabo, Director
Economic and Social Policy
International Development
Research Centre

Where knowledge on gender and security does exist, it is largely concentrated within affected communities in forms that are not visible, ‘validated’ or utilized. There is very little social science, public health or operational research about the local level impacts of crises on gender and generational relations and how this varies across different settings. Jacqueline O’Neill, Director of the Institute for Inclusive Security, spoke to the risks of engaging in conflict settings without fully understanding local context. “Some people want to move forward,” she said, “and some people just want to move forward without background.” But developing the appropriate metrics and expertise to generate the needed information will also require new expertise within and across different disciplines and sectors, from urban planning to post-conflict financing. Much stronger connections are needed within the academy, across and within disciplines, and regions of the world. And new approaches are needed to aggregate learning and catalyze new fields of research. Continual growth and learning will depend on how well knowledge and practice are mutually reinforcing.

Supporting a new generation of scholars with expertise on gender and security issues will be essential for building the evidence base and knowledge in this emerging field. But extreme disparities in higher education, especially in Africa, and negligible investments in southern research and training institutions pose additional challenges for strengthening the capacity of scholars in the south to analyze their own problems and shape intellectual and policy agendas.

⁵ Peace and Security Funders Group. 2011. “Peace and Security Grantmaking by U.S. Foundations, 2008-2009.” http://peaceandsecurity.org/415/PSFGreport_Jan2011.pdf

Knowing what works, what doesn't and why

Although much attention is given to increasing women's leadership in peacebuilding, there is scant evidence of impact, especially in conflict-affected and fragile states, where formal structures of governance have little influence on the social institutions that perpetuate gender inequalities. Many policy prescriptions in the field of gender and security are based on assumptions or 'best practices' that have yet to be evaluated. From media campaigns and microcredit, to privatization and demobilization programs, the impact of development assistance and humanitarian action on reducing violence against women and increasing women's empowerment has not been systematically assessed. Very little is known about the factors that influence the impact of interventions or how these may vary across different settings, including situations that are not affected by conflict. In which contexts are women more likely to enter parliament, for example, and what are the factors that determine their ability to advance gender equality? What are the best leverage points within the policy process, what kind of 'women's machinery' is most effective? Without understanding the impact of these strategies, both intended and unintended, sustainable peacebuilding for women and their communities will remain elusive.

V. CREATING A FUNDING COMMUNITY

The UN brings legitimacy, access to intergovernmental bodies, access to decision-making and to leaders in different countries. ... Private funders bring flexibility, higher capacity, and an appetite for innovation and an independence that intergovernmental bodies cannot have. They have access to expertise when it is needed and can bring rapid response support. Private funders have a long-term perspective, while the UN and multilaterals fundamentally do not, [since] their political masters can switch gears.

Kathleen Cravero, President, Oak Foundation

Bilateral and multilateral programs are the most significant source of funding in the area of 'women, peace and security,' primarily in the context of international development cooperation and aid to conflict-affected countries.⁶ Activities are also supported through UN entities such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund, the United Nations Children's Fund and the recently established United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women). UN Women's work on peace and security, one of five priorities in its strategic plan, is guided by relevant Security Council Resolutions and regional commitments to gender equality, and the needs and priorities determined by Member States, upon their request.⁷

In contrast, US private foundation grantmaking on peace and security, human rights and gender equality is directed primarily to civil society and non-governmental organizations and few have dedicated

⁶ The failure of multilateral organizations to promote gender equality in fragile states has been well documented. A recent review by the UK Department for International Development concluded that two-thirds of multilateral organizations outside of the UN, including all of the multilateral development banks and private sector development organizations, the European Commission, and half of the global fund and humanitarian organizations have been weak or unsatisfactory in this regard, (Department for International Development, 2011, "Multilateral Aid Review: Ensuring maximum value for UK aid through multilateral organizations)." A recent OECD assessment of bilateral aid to fragile states found that only 20% of allocations for peace and security target gender equality and, within this sector, only 10% of allocations within security system management and reform included a focus on gender equality (OECD-DAC, 2010, "Aid in support of gender equality and women's empowerment).

⁷The implementation of UN Women's mandate is supervised by its Executive board in consultation with the respective national machineries for women and/or the focal points designated by the Member States (General Assembly resolution 64/289, 21 July 2010). UN Women's Executive Board includes all five permanent members of the Security Council and countries that have yet to meet their own international obligations to protecting women's human rights, including Saudi Arabia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

programs in the area of ‘women, peace and security.’ Although some discussions about gender and security have begun to take place among ‘like-minded’ donors, there exists no institutional channel through which the philanthropic community can discuss priorities or share best practices. Said one participant, “Even when donors do have a commitment to addressing gender throughout their grantmaking, there are few agreed upon approaches or gender policies.”

As a first step toward assessing funding patterns in this area, Katherine Magraw, Director of the Peace and Security Funders Group, presented a preliminary survey of grantmaking on gender and security based on the 2010 grants of 30 private foundations (mainly US, but also including a handful of European foundations). She found that over half of all grantmaking in this area supports ‘women’s leadership and political participation,’ and mainly in the form of training, conferences, and other ‘empowerment’ activities. Another third supports initiatives to address sexual violence and only six percent is allocated for research and analysis. Regarding geographic priorities, one-third of the grants identified went to Africa, with smaller percentages to South Asia and the Middle East. Among recipients overall, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton attracted at least \$8 million from US private foundations in 2010 for the Office of Global Women’s Issues – an Office committed to advancing the rights of women and girls as a central focus of US diplomatic, development and defense interests. This is far more private foundation grant dollars than any one recipient among non-governmental organizations working on gender and conflict.⁸

Those working on gender issues in foundations without specialized programs often feel marginalized and find it difficult to gain support within their organizations. They also point to the role of philanthropy in replicating gender hierarchies, even in the social justice sectors. Most private funding for gender and security is small-scale and distributed according to a specific donor interest or geographic priority. These localized pockets of funding tend to support catalytic and innovative demonstration activities and, despite their success or innovation, rarely have the resources to go to scale or achieve a broader impact. Although short-term and rapid-response grantmaking is often needed in crisis situations, long-term and flexible funding strategies are even more crucial for sustaining women’s organizations and creating the conditions needed to support the kind of social change that evolves over time.

“Those working on conflict in fragile states are completely removed from the people working on women and gender ... you have to force a conversation to take place. And when you do see the overlap, the risk of trying to infuse the gender perspective into other thematic areas is losing the explicit focus on women.”

David Arnold, President
Asia Foundation

Supportive funders that do not have discrete gender programs or institutional mechanisms for working in conflict situations may rely on intermediary operating foundations with specialized expertise to re-grant funds. These operating foundations, such as the Global Fund for Women, Mama Cash, Urgent Action, and the African Women’s Development Foundation, often determine funding priorities and opportunities in collaboration with local partners, and through regional and thematic advisory groups. But they find it difficult to attract funding for issues that may be considered more controversial, such as anti-militarism and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender rights; and for those issues that are not

⁸ Women’s political participation and mitigating sexual and gender based violence are two of seven policy priorities which also include climate change, economic security and empowerment, education, food security and health. Approximately one-third of programs supported by the office are directly related to and/or located in conflict-affected countries (<http://www.state.gov/s/gwi/programs/index.htm>).

generally considered to be within the boundaries of grantmaking for peace and security, such as trafficking, and personal and family violence.

VI. ESTABLISHING AN AGENDA, BUILDING A FIELD: NEXT STEPS

How do we make sure that issues of women and girls are interwoven into the DNA of the security and development communities? That is the challenge.

Sarah Mendelson, Deputy Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (USAID)

Participants grappled with the challenges of building a ‘field’ and ‘community’ that is both sufficiently expansive and unifying. “A community can only be built, and funding leveraged,” said Gina Brown, Chair and Coordinator of the Office of HIV/AIDS Research at the National Institutes for Health, “if there are common goals and some consensus on priorities.” Effective field building both reflects and learns from the realities on the ground. It requires communication and a shared language; the ability to go beyond a single task or mandate, to share agendas and best practices. It can draw attention to the distinctions between different contexts and identify when generalizations are valid and when they are not. “While movement building is driven more by activism and problem solving from the grassroots,” said Stephanie Clohesy, Founder and Principal of Clohesy Consulting, “field building takes place at the level of organizations and requires systematic documentation, training, research, education and the

establishment of organizational structures and standard procedures.” Added Craig Calhoun, SSRC President, “The bet of field building is that there can be something bigger, beyond the daily picture that can feed into a broader ecology, while it can also be distinguished from other fields.”

“We need to not only listen to grassroots activists, but also to situate power within the grassroots. The degree of commitment among activists and politicians is most effective when there are opportunities for real relationship building, transparent dialogue and developing long-term goals and joint initiatives.”

Terry Greenblatt
Executive Director and CEO

New fields of philanthropy often have an elite beginning and then try to add on local perspectives to frameworks that are developed far from the realities within which they intend to engage and without fully consulting or understanding the perspectives of intended beneficiaries. A different approach is needed to ensure that funders have the kind of information they need to make strategic decisions and to ensure that the philanthropic ‘narrative’ is both informed and represented by those for whom their initiatives are intended to support.

In describing how her organization has begun to strengthen global solidarity among Network members in the US and abroad, Michele Ozumba, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Women’s Funding Network said that, “Poverty, immigration, economic security and gender-based violence are among the many issues affecting women and girls where the geographic divide between the US and global is increasingly less relevant in framing strategies and policy agendas.” Making global connections and distinctions will require public education and increased demand for information and action by policymakers, the media, NGOs and the private sector. Ozumba added, “The Women’s Funding Network offers a valuable infrastructure for knowledge diffusion and collaboration in further building this field and championing the goals for effective gender lens philanthropy.” Three broad areas for action emerged from the discussion:

1

Identifying Funding Patterns and Trends

Money, money, money is the most important thing. It is hard to raise money, and a lot of funding in this area comes from individuals because foundations are not giving big checks. Corporations didn't want to be involved, and some of those from which you would expect support are the most difficult to engage.

Abigail Disney, President, Daphne Foundation and
Executive Producer, Women, War & Peace Film Series

In order to leverage broader impacts of grantmaking in gender, peace and security, a common agenda is needed around which some level of consensus can be built and to which a wide variety of funding frameworks can cohere. This agenda could take a range of forms, including through global commitments, by establishing thematic priorities, geographic foci or even strategic approaches that emphasize research or training. The aim is to maximize the potential of 'project' approaches and 'niche' funding strategies, especially among smaller donors, while broadening opportunities to mobilize resources for the more costly investments needed over longer periods of time to develop basic infrastructure for peacebuilding – human, physical and otherwise. For this reason, it is important to establish an agenda – or multiple agendas – that multilateral (including the international financial institutions), bilateral funding and private donors can support. This will require both collaboration and learning. Michael Hirschhorn, Executive Director of the International Human Rights Funders Group, said that, "Although many funders may share similar interests, they all march to the beats of different drummers ... field building in this situation is challenging ... integrat[ing] gender [dimensions] into human rights philanthropy will require an intensive peer driven learning strategy." Andrea Taylor, North America Community Affairs Director at Microsoft Corporation, also encouraged new thinking about how to engage corporate funders in field building efforts. "They often have a huge, global reach," she said, and "can sometimes be more nimble than philanthropies and often more connected to governments."

A series of mapping exercises are proposed to identify achievements and gaps in this emerging field that are substantive, thematic, capacity-oriented and resource-related. These would provide a substantive basis for a more specific discussion of funding strategies and to identify areas where there is a convergence or absence of funder interest. These rapid assessments would identify key achievements, protagonists, locations and themes around which activity is taking place. On this basis, they would also propose new ideas about how to address the gaps and ensure complementarity. Proposed assessments include:

- **A rapid mapping of UN and bilateral support in areas outside of Security Council Resolution 1325, namely with respect to fragile states and humanitarian action;**
- **A comprehensive survey of US funding for gender and security, including issues relating to gender, security and militarism in the US;**
- **An assessment of philanthropy trends in the global south in Africa, Latin America, Asia and the Arab region;**
- **An international assessment of women's funds in relation to themes, strategies and geographic priorities;**
- **An assessment of potential contributions by the private sector, including in relation to political and technical resources.**

2 Creating Affinity

On the conversation of gender – know your ecosystem. ... In many institutions gender and security are treated very differently. Gender is often perceived as the soft, the marginalized, the less rigorous ... while security is the hard, the tough and inaccessible How do we engage both ways: getting security into gender, and gender into security?

Margaret Hempel, Program

Director

Sexuality and Reproductive Health and Rights, Ford Foundation

While much is being done to systematize ‘lessons learned’ among multilateral and bilateral donors, particularly in relation to the implementation of 1325, no equivalent initiative exists among private foundations. A clear need exists for a mechanism(s) to provide regular fora for funders that are interested in working in the area of women, peace and security. These should provide funders with the information they need to make strategic decisions while supporting a process of field building that beings with ‘listening’ rather than ‘funding.’ It can help foster learning and collaboration and overcome the silo-ization that currently characterizes funding in this area.

- **Develop an institutional gender assessment tool to support donors in identifying strategies to integrate gender within existing programs, establish new foci, and address the implications of these findings for budgets, staffing, funding mechanisms;**
- **Carry out an assessment of other field and movement building efforts in social change philanthropy, for example in relation to social entrepreneurship;**
- **In collaboration with a progressive media institution, develop a ‘message’ and communications strategy to represent the emergence of this field and engage new constituencies;**
- **Establish a centralized web platform that will provide information and online tools for interested donors.**

3 Assessing Knowledge Needs and Gaps

This field needs networks and mutual understanding. It also needs an evidence base, but the metrics haven’t yet evolved. It needs research that measures continual movement in this area, that pays more attention to the gaps and that generates new ideas. It also needs different voices that bring new perspectives so that funders can make better decisions and networks can be more effective.

Craig Calhoun, President, Social Science Research Council

Establishing a sufficiently broad ‘women, peace and security’ agenda around which a wide variety of funding frameworks can coalesce will require a much stronger evidence base, better quality research, and improved metrics for assessing impact. The SSRC-incubated International Centre for Gender, Peace and Security seeks to meet these needs by mobilizing knowledge, strengthening capacities and supporting research that will increase women’s security and the gender-responsiveness of peacebuilding policies, programs and institutions. It has identified research capacity needs in crisis-affected, developing and transition countries, as well as strategies for sharing knowledge and increasing the

visibility, dissemination and utilization of experience-based knowledge and existing research, and linking research, policy and practice. Building on this base, recommendations were made to:

- **Identify knowledge gaps and needs across specific themes and policy arenas (e.g. the gender dimensions of areas in which gender has traditionally been ignored, from post-conflict macroeconomic and security sector reforms to infrastructure and community development);**
- **Undertake a rapid mapping process of research priorities, gaps and needs among affected communities (in collaboration with existing non-governmental regional advisory bodies on women's issues);**
- **Develop a monitoring and evaluation framework which takes into account contextual, institutional and operational issues that influence the processes of integrating gender into peace and security programs, policies and approaches.**

VII. CONCLUSION

At its most basic, field building is a coming together of multilaterals, private funds, researchers, advocates and NGOs in a way that consistently initiates action, learning and systemic change. We have all been to many coming-togethers that don't lead to change. If this could be the beginning of true field building on gender, peace and security, it would be a significant start to creating a strong, robust, multi-sector, multi-partner field that will generate action, help us learn and create positive change.

Kathleen Cravero, President, Oak Foundation

The mantra, 'listen to the women,' must be the conscience against which this agenda is taken forward. Very few women's voices have actually been heard and, when they are, the messages and perspectives are as varied as the constituencies and/or issues they represent. What they do share in common is clear: weak institutions, few platforms and a hugely limited scope for influencing security and peacebuilding policies and practices. "There is a lot of potential; there just aren't enough funders" said Katherine Magraw, "and lots of barriers to collaboration."

This first Roundtable Discussion on Women, Peace and Security was successful in surfacing a wide range of challenges and opportunities for building a more cohesive field of research, practice and activism. It also demonstrated the very strong potential for establishing a core group of leaders within the funding community with whom this agenda can be advanced. Both processes must be iterative and mutually reinforcing. The SSRC will continue to nurture this discussion and seek partners interested in following up the rich tapestry of ideas that emerged.

Since the Roundtable took place, two significant milestones were reached. The selection of three women Nobel Peace Laureates - Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Leymah Gbowee and Tawakkul Karman - and an Executive Order, signed by President Obama, instituting a National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security. These achievements demonstrate the tangible impact of investing in women's leadership and institutions and create new opportunities for increasing women's security and their participation in peacebuilding.

“This Roundtable discussion on Women, Peace and Security is a first step toward forging a vision and funding community that unite in a shared commitment to a more peaceful and more secure world. Our aim is to map the contours and content of an emergent but fragmented field. In doing so, we want to assess the challenges and opportunities for making women and gender issues more central to our respective funding and engagement strategies. We want to learn from one another and find ways of connecting across disciplines, regions, sectors and communities of practice. We want to identify the knowledge needs and gaps that, if met, can strengthen our contribution to peace building. We want to ensure that investments made in this work are cumulatively greater than those taken independently. And, mostly, we want to identify concrete ways in which our shared vision, with all of its variation, can be more effectively realized.”

Jennifer F. Klot, Founding Board Member
International Centre for Gender, Peace and Security

PARTICIPANTS

David Abramowitz
Humanity United

David Arnold
Asia Foundation

Tom Asher
Social Science Research Council

Susan Braden
US State Department

Gina Brown
National Institutes for Health

Charlotte Bunch
Center for Women's Global Leadership

Charlanne Burke
The Rockefeller Foundation

Craig Calhoun
Social Science Research Council

Stephanie Clohesy
Clohesy Consulting

Carol Cohn
Consortium on Gender, Security, and Human Rights

Karen Colvard
The Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation

Patricia Cooper
Women's Regional Network

Kathleen Cravero
Oak Foundation

Antonie De Jong
UN Women

Abigail Disney
Daphne Foundation

Maryam Elahi
Open Society Foundations

C.D. Glin
The Rockefeller Foundation

Billie Goodman
American Jewish World Service

Anne-Marie Goetz
UN Women

Heather Grady
The Rockefeller Foundation

Terry Greenblatt
Urgent Action Fund

Joan (Josie) Hadden
TerraFocus

Margaret Hempel
Ford Foundation

John Hendra
UN Women

Michael J. Hirschhorn
International Human Rights Funders Group

Jennifer F. Klot
Social Science Research Council

Yvonne C. Lodico
UN Institute for Training and Research

Katherine Magraw
Peace and Security Funders Group

Sheetal Matani
The Rockefeller Foundation

Sarah E. Mendelson
USAID

Funmi Olonisakin
African Leadership Centre

Jacqueline O'Neill
Institute for Inclusive Security

Michele Ozumba
Women's Funding Network

Eileen Pennington
Asia Foundation

Regan Ralph
Fund for Global Human Rights

Judith Rodin
The Rockefeller Foundation

Jordan Ryan
UN Development Programme

Pamela Shifman
NoVo Foundation

Suzanne Siskel
Ford Foundation

Stephanie Smith
Compton Foundation

Theo Sowa
African Women's Development Fund

Sue Szabo
International Development Research Centre

Andrea Taylor
Microsoft Corporation

Sarah Taylor
NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security

Katrin Wilde
Channel Foundation

Appreciation is extended to those who were unable to participate in the Roundtable but gave their time generously in prior consultations: Carol Angir, Mama Cash; Jamille Bigio, Rachel Tulchin and Sharon Kotok, US Department of State; Mayra Buvinic, World Bank; Betsy Campbell, Rockefeller Brothers Foundation; Michael Edington and Michelle Farley, Wellspring Advisors; Sheherazade Hirji, Tides Canada; Peter Laugharn, Firelight Foundation; Shalini Nataraj, Global Fund for Women; Sally Osberg, Skoll Foundation; Ana Oliveira, The New York Women's Foundation; Evelyn Thornton, Institute for Inclusive Security; Carol Yost, Asia Foundation.