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About Peacebuilding in Practice Papers

Interpeace’s Peacebuilding in Practice Papers (PiP) are designed to showcase high-level learnings from its programme work. PiP findings are often drawn from in-depth evaluation processes and reflections from Interpeace’s programme teams. PiP aims to contribute to greater knowledge and learning not only by Interpeace teams but also the broader peacebuilding sector.

Reference Guide

The present Peacebuilding in Practice paper lays out the foundations for gender inclusive peacebuilding and is a result of a reflection process that Interpeace took between 2017 and 2019 to examine its implementation of gender programming. It demonstrates lessons learned and recommendations for developing, implementing and evaluating gender inclusive programmes. This Peacebuilding in Practice paper, developed through a consultative process across Interpeace offices as well as on an extensive literature review, aims to strengthen Interpeace’s capacity to bring its unique contribution to building sustainable peace and advancing gender equality. The practice note is intended to be complemented by the development and application of tools and processes that allow for the effective implementation of the ten identified foundations.

The practice paper is presented in three parts. Part One presents key definitions and how gender inclusive peacebuilding is reflected in Interpeace’s frameworks and working approaches. Part Two presents a literature overview to ensure a common understanding of the importance of gender in peacebuilding. Part Three presents ten foundations that emerged from Interpeace’s internal recommendations which are enriched by the experiences and recommendations of other key peacebuilding actors and thinkers in the field. The practice note provides a basis for future programming and interventions that are progressively more gender inclusive, as well as a guide for learning from and assessing gender inclusive peacebuilding practice.
Why Gender Matters in Peacebuilding

• **Conflict dynamics are inherently gendered.** Analysing the gendered nature of conflict dynamics deepens understanding of conflicts themselves and lays a more comprehensive foundation for developing relevant and effective strategies for countering violence and promoting peace.

• **Gender identities and expressions of masculinities and femininities influence how men, women, boys and girls engage in violent conflicts.** Understanding the relationship between masculinities, femininities and how they manifest in conflict dynamics, is important for developing strategies that aim at transforming behaviours and relationships to promote more peaceful expressions of masculinity and femininity for long-term peacebuilding.

• **Gender influences the types of vulnerabilities that individuals face before, during and after violent conflicts.** In a peacebuilding context, it is important to identify, understand and address these specific vulnerabilities to prevent recurrent cycles of violence, provide alternatives for peace and build societies more resilient to violent conflict.

• **Gender influences the capacities of resilience developed and exercised by individuals and groups in the face of violent conflict.** Understanding the gendered nature of these resilience capacities and how they manifest in conflict and post-conflict settings can enable peacebuilders to harness and build upon these capacities to broaden peace agency and bring diverse actors into peacebuilding processes.

• **Gender norms have an impact how individuals and groups, participate in, influence and shape peace process.** For gender inclusive processes to positively contribute to peacebuilding efforts, they must go beyond representation and include opportunities and strategies for influencing, strategies that specifically challenge and transform power for more equal decision-making.
Ten Foundations for Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding Practice

The following Ten Foundations were identified through a series of programmatic and institutional reflections. They provide guidance on what practitioners should do to navigate the challenges presented by gender inclusive peacebuilding programming, to better understand the gendered dynamics of conflict and to develop effective strategies to leverage gender inclusion for more effective peacebuilding programming and to advance gender equality.

1. **Strengthen the capacity of staff, partners and those engaged by programmatic and policy interventions to analyse gender and to design and implement gender inclusive interventions;**

2. **Conduct gendered conflict analyses to inform programming;**

3. **Build intersectoral linkages and connect with organizations working explicitly on gender;**

4. **Create safe spaces and opportunities for marginalised and excluded groups to voice their vulnerabilities and needs, to transform themselves in the aftermath of conflict and to develop confidence and capacity for effective engagement in peacebuilding and decision-making;**

5. **Work on masculinities and engage men and boys to understand their gender specific sources of vulnerability and resilience, address gendered drivers of violent conflict, strengthen gender resilience against violent conflict and promote women's empowerment and gender equality;**
6. Utilize participatory processes and creative approaches to promote meaningful inclusion of women, men, boys and girls;

7. Ensure efforts to promote gender inclusion in peacebuilding are locally led and contextually adapted;

8. Integrate gender into monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks, activities and tools to encourage practices of collecting and analysing gender disaggregated data, applying a gender lens; mapping the impacts for different actors and generating more evidence on the impact of gender inclusive programming;

9. Embed gender inclusivity in institutional frameworks guiding organizational, programmatic and policy engagement practices;

10. Engage donors to align priorities for gender equality and inclusivity in peacebuilding to local realities and priorities.
Defining Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding: Key Terms

Gender

“Gender refers to the social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women, girls, men and boys ... These attributes, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed and learned through socialization processes. They are context/time-specific and changeable. Gender determines what is expected, allowed and valued in women, girls, men and boys in a given context. In most societies there are differences and inequalities between women and men in responsibilities assigned, activities undertaken, access to and control over resources, and decision-making opportunities.”

— UN Office of the Special Advisor on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women

Gender Equality

According to UN Women gender equality “refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys. Equality does not mean that women and men will become the same but that women’s and men’s rights, responsibilities and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. Gender equality implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognising the diversity of different groups of women and men.” UNICEF’s 2018-2021 Gender Action Plan notes that “gender equality is realised when women and men and girls and boys enjoy the same rights, resources, opportunities and protections...Shifts in gender equality require not only awareness and behaviour change, but also changes in the fundamental power dynamics that define gender norms and relationships.” USAID, in their Gender Equality Policy, also note that “gender equality concerns women and men, and it involves working with men and boys, women and girls to bring about changes in attitudes, behaviours, roles and responsibilities at home, in the workplace, and in the community. Genuine equality means more than parity in numbers or laws on the books; it means expanding freedoms and improving overall quality of life so that equality is achieved without sacrificing gains for males or females.”

Gender Inclusivity

A qualitative concept that refers to the combination and result of ‘sensitive’ (theory/design) and ‘responsive’ approaches (operational/practical) that enables and enhances women’s, men’s, boys’, girls’, and sexual and gender minorities’, equal representation and participation in decision-making processes.


Group Meeting on Women’s meaningful participation in negotiating peace and implementing of peace agreements.

Intersectionality

According to the Gender and Development Network: “Intersectionality refers to the way in which multiple forms of discrimination – based on gender, race, sexuality, disability and class, etc. – overlap and interact with one another to shape how different individuals and groups experience discrimination.”

Intersectionality enables us to look at people not as monolithic groups but as individuals whose experiences are shaped by multiple identities. It also enables us to recognise that the definitions above of gender and gender equality approach gender as binary concepts (women/girls vs. men/boys) and do not account for other gender identities (LGBTI+) or the complexity of identities of women/girls, men and boys based on other factors that intersect with their gender identity to shape their experiences of inclusion, exclusion, power and marginalisation.

Inclusive Peacebuilding

Former UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, during his address to the Security Council on 8 October 2012, defined “inclusive peacebuilding” as “the extent and manner in which the views and needs of parties to conflict and other stakeholders are represented, heard and integrated into a peace process.”

Settlements – even those concluded initially for a limited purpose, such as achieving a ceasefire – should be progressively broadened to permit wider citizen participation. While inclusivity may not necessarily imply that all stakeholders participate directly in formal negotiation, an inclusive process goes beyond the representation of parties to conflict by facilitating their interaction with other stakeholders and creating mechanisms that allow for the inclusion of different perspectives in the process, including those of women’s groups... Inclusivity needs to be applied throughout peacebuilding, from analysis, design and planning to implementation and monitoring.”


3 As will be discussed further in the context, representation alone is insufficient. The quality of participation and the extent to which people are heard and integrated into peace processes is a significant marker for the success of peace processes.

4 https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Peacebuilding%20in%20the%20aftermath%20of%20
Peace Direct refers to Inclusive Peace as “the idea that all stakeholders in a society should have a role in defining and shaping peace.”

Patriarchy

Lerner Gerda defines patriarchy as “the manifestation and institutionalisation of male dominance over women and children in family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general. It implies that men hold power in all the important institution of society and that women are deprived of access to such power. It does not imply that women are either totally powerless or totally deprived of rights, influence and resources.” Patriarchy, an underpinning of gender exclusion, is the most common form of exclusion across societies globally. In “Intersectionality: A key for Men to Break Out of the Patriarchal Prison,” Jerker Edstrom, Satish Singh and Thea Shahrokh argue that patriarchy “can actually account for ethnic, economic and other social stratification far better than most other logics of social differentiation, as it vertically connects individuals into horizontally segregated groups through the male ‘blood-line’, over time re/distributing resources and gold in relation to belonging and blood.”

Masculinities and Femininities

Michael Kimmel describes masculinities and femininities as “the social roles, behaviours, and meanings prescribed for men and women in any society at any time. Such normative gender ideologies must be distinguished from biological ‘sex,’ and must be understood to be plural as there is no single definition for all men and all women. Masculinities and femininities are structured and expressed through other axes of identity such as class, race, ethnicity, age, and sexuality. Thus, some definitions are held up as the hegemonic versions, against which others are measured. Gender ideologies are more than properties of individuals; masculinities and femininities are also institutionally organized and elaborated and experienced through interactions.”

---


Institutional Framework for Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding at Interpeace

Interpeace believes that inclusion, particularly of marginalised and historically excluded groups, is fundamental to the sustainability of all peacebuilding efforts. Its approach to gender inclusive peacebuilding is firmly rooted in Interpeace’s institutional frameworks and approaches:

- **Interpeace’s change framework:** The first pillar of Interpeace’s change framework seeks to reduce violence and enhance safety and security by among other things, transforming violent individuals and groups to become agents for peace and strengthening community mechanisms to manage safety and security inclusively and non-violently. The second pillar of Interpeace’s change framework seeks to build more resilient and inclusive societies. Interpeace firmly believes that for peace to be sustainable and societies to be resilient, meaningful inclusion of all sectors of society, including actors that have been engaged in violence, is necessary. The transformation of individuals and groups and the promotion of gender inclusion, with keen attention to and consideration of intersectional gender identities, is central in the pursuit of safer and more resilient and inclusive societies.

- **Interpeace’s Track 6 approach:** Interpeace’s Track 6 approach aims to connect all levels of society by working with and linking local communities, civil society, governments and the international community. In the application of the Track 6 approach, Interpeace seeks to also link diverse actors both within and across these levels; these include actors with different gender and other intersectional identities such as age, ethnic and religious background, positions of influence, etc. Participatory approaches such as multi-stakeholder dialogue, which are underpinnings of all of our programming, engage people across different identity markers to enable them to contribute to the formulation of more effective laws, policies and other peacebuilding and statebuilding initiatives at the national and regional levels. Thus, in our Track 6 approach, we aim to bring together people of different intersectional gender identities with different levels of power and influence, to create connections that enable them to work collectively to build more inclusive societies in the aftermath of violent conflict.8

8 How different actors are engaged in our processes will be guided by gendered conflict analysis. Not every stakeholder will participate in every process. However, as much as possible and appropriate, Interpeace will see to ensure diversity and meaningful inclusion both within and across the Track 1, Track 2 and Track 6 levels.
• **Interpeace Peacebuilding Principles**: Interpeace's approach to gender seeks to build *horizontal trust*, between individuals and groups of diverse gender identities, and *vertical trust*, between groups of diverse gender identities and their governments. Its intersectional approach recognises that identities, access and privilege are influenced by gender and other identities, imploring outreach to all groups. Interpeace recognizes that the quest for gender equality as for peacebuilding is a transformational process that requires *long-term commitment*. Interpeace embeds gender inclusion in its broader process for transformation recognizing that *process matters* as much as results.
From Gender Blind to Gender Sensitive to Gender Inclusive

Interpeace’s approach aims to ensure that programmatic and policy interventions are not gender blind and aim to move beyond being gender sensitive to being meaningfully gender inclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Blind</th>
<th>Gender Sensitive</th>
<th>Gender Inclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does not taken into account gender norms, roles and relations;</td>
<td>• Recognises gender norms, roles and relations as well as resilience capacities;</td>
<td>• Analyses gender norms, roles and relations as well as resilience capacities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ignores differences in vulnerabilities or resilience capacities;</td>
<td>• Does not necessarily address inequalities generated by norms, roles and relations;</td>
<td>• Develops and implements strategies to address the specific vulnerabilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treats everyone the same;</td>
<td>• Demonstrates awareness of gender and other inequalities without taking action to</td>
<td>• Adopts strategies that seek to address sources of exclusion and marginalisation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potentially reinforces gender and other biases.</td>
<td>address them.</td>
<td>• Deliberately creates opportunities for meaningful participation, changes in power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dynamics and influence on decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*World Health Organization*  

---

Why Gender Matters in Peacebuilding

Conflict dynamics are inherently gendered

Over the past two decades, there has been an increased recognition of the importance of analysing and being responsive to gender dimensions of conflict. Nevertheless, conflict analyses often fail to analyse gender beyond the lens of sexual and gender-based violence and the understanding of how gender interacts with conflict has remained at the level of analysing impacts of conflicts.10 There has been limited focus on understanding how gender norms and their influence on access to and expressions of power influence conflict dynamics in themselves. Depending on the context, gender norms can influence and reinforce conflict dynamics.

A 2005 study by the World Bank entitled Young Men and the Construction of Masculinity in Sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for HIV/AIDS, Conflict and Violence finds for example, strong links between young men’s engagement in violence and their inability to fulfil expected gender norms for men such as securing a job and starting a family.11 This, compounded by a sense of disempowerment resulting from the concentration of power, access to resources and ability to initiate relationships with women wielded by older or privileged men, motivated young men to participate in violent insurgencies and conflicts in order to obtain power and challenge institutionalized stratification. More recently, Saferworld’s report on Masculinities, Conflict and Peacebuilding highlights how gender norms in South Sudan associate cattle raiding and gun ownership with rites of passage for boys to become men, contributing to fuelling cycles of conflict between and within communities.12 Interpeace’s research in Mali finds that among certain Touareg communities, social capital is built based on engagement in rebellions, combat or acts of adventure which intrinsically link social relationships such as marriage to the engagement in violence.13 Further Saferworld research in Uganda, Myanmar and Yemen

had revealed that overarching conflict dynamics such as land grabbing and consequential intra and intercommunal land conflicts are gendered both in their causes and drivers, in addition to their impacts.\(^{14}\)

Several studies have found correlations between gender inequality and propensity for violent conflict. The most recent of these is the *Women Peace and Security index*; the writers observed that “higher levels of gender inequality in education, financial inclusion, and employment, as well as higher levels of intimate partner violence and adolescent fertility, are significantly correlated with greater risks of violent conflict.”\(^{15}\) Yet efforts towards equality also influence conflict dynamics. Interpeace’s 2017 research on gender and youth violence in Côte d’Ivoire and Mali entitled *I walk with the boys* finds that the increased economic empowerment of women is an emerging driver of conflict, particularly as it shifts traditional gender roles.\(^{16}\)

**Note for Practitioners:** These are just a few examples of how gender influences conflict drivers and dynamics. Analysing the gendered dynamics of conflict, or asking what is it about gender that matters, enables a more profound understanding of conflict drivers, providing a more comprehensive foundation for developing relevant and effective strategies to counter violence and to build peace. As the UN PBF notes, “since gender analysis can help us understand complex relationships, power relations and roles in society, it is a powerful tool for analysing conflict and building peace.”\(^{17}\)

---


See also: Saferworld, ‘Briefing - Building Inclusive Peace: Gender at The Heart of Conflict Analysis’ (Saferworld, 2017).


Gender identities and expressions of masculinities and femininities influence how men, women, boys and girls engage in violent conflicts

A 2002 World Health Organization (WHO) report on Violence and Health found that men commit significantly more acts of direct violence than women, with men between ages 15 and 44 being the primary perpetrators of violence. While these statistics have not changed much over time, there has been increasing research to understand the link between masculinity and violence. A 2012 World Bank report suggests that “worldwide, the majority of men and boys internalise the pressure to live up to rigid ideals about how they should behave and feel as men.” These norms around men’s behaviour are often steeped in what is called ‘hegemonic masculinity’.

Hegemonic masculinities refers to societal notions of what is perceived as the ‘ideal man’. While this ideal varies in location and time, it is usually associated with heterosexuality, marriage, fatherhood, authority, professional success and physical prowess. The hegemonic ideal is something that only few men achieve fully, although most men comply to key aspects of it through what RW Connell coined as complicit masculinities. The more men comply to the notion, the more they reap the ‘patriarchal’ dividends, which are the cultural and societal benefits associated with being a man.

The pressure to live up to these ideals of masculinity may be a key driver of men’s engagement in violence in general, and in violent conflict in particular. Men who are in a difficult position to comply to the ideal sometimes find ways to challenge the ideal altogether by displaying what has been termed “protest masculinities.” Gwen Broude describes these masculinities as “extreme forms of sex-types behaviour on the part of some males.” She goes on to describe expressions of these masculinities: “key to the concept of protest masculinity are high levels of physical aggressions. The protest masculinity profile is also proposed including destructiveness, low tolerance for delay of gratification, crime, drinking and similar dispositions.” Interpeace’s research in Mali and Cote d’Ivoire found that the progressive transformation of women led some men to engage in behaviours such as intimate partner violence or involvement in violent groups and gangs to reaffirm their role as head of the family.

20 Hegemonic masculinity was coined by R. W. Connell in 1982; however, the term became popular through her 1995 book Masculinities.
Yet, Vess et al. note that: “Many factors contribute to men engaging in violent conflict. Some of these factors are structural and contextual, and some are individual and psychosocial, and they overlap and interact in several ways.”

Heilman and Barker assert that “boys and men are often raised, socialized, and/or encouraged to be violent, depending on their social surroundings and life conditions.” For example, the 2005 World Bank study focused on young men, and masculinities in Africa mentioned above notes that the extreme violence and brutality witnessed in conflict settings were learned behaviours “reinforced by social structures at the community level, and sometimes at the family level” and “learned by modelling, reinforcement, shame, overt threats and coercion.” Among other factors Vess et al found to contribute to men engaging in violence across contexts are economic frustration, early exposure to violence, traumatic indoctrination and the glorification of militaries.

However, as Green, Robles and Pawlak note, “around the world, boys and men do challenge rigid ideas of manhood and actively participate to promote social change in their households, in their communities, and through their participation in public discourse.” This is important because masculinities and masculine identities are neither monolithic nor fixed, even in conflict and post-conflict settings.

Similarly, femininities are diverse and dynamic and shape the way in which women engage in violent conflict. Most research on gender and conflict has focused on the impact on violence on women, with many reports noting the vulnerabilities of women in conflict environments. Less attention has been focused on the role that women play in violent conflict. International Alert’s report, Gender in Peacebuilding—Taking Stock, notes that “women are less commonly engaged directly in combat or violence, yet they support violence in many indirect ways, e.g. by providing services to fighters, through the way they educate their children, and by encouraging men to engage in violence.” While both women and men often utilize these strategies to engage in violence, women’s exercise of these roles are more invisible as they align with social expectations around femininity.

However, as highlighted in Accord’s report on Conflict, Peace and Patriarchy, “in some cases, they are directly engaged in combat – such as in Sierra Leone, Liberia, Nepal, Sri Lanka and the Maoist movement in India…. women directly or indirectly aid violence by performing an array

of activities such as nursing, spying, fundraising and fighting, and as suicide bombers.” Interpeace’s 2012 study on Violent Women and Violence Against Women among gangs in Central America found that where women had historically played roles that were consistent with patriarchal norms, such as being girlfriends, partners and mothers of gang members, their role began to transform and women began to engage in activities such as extortion, attacks, drug smuggling and arms trafficking, roles associated with more direct engagement in violence. A 2015 survey conducted by the Somaliland National Youth Organization Umbrella (SONYO) and Interpeace on Somaliland Youth violence and Youth Role in Peacebuilding found that among the 1200 youth surveyed, there was marginal difference between the percentage of male (34%) and female (29%) respondents who admitted to being engaged in acts of violence, with female respondents more so than male respondents admitting to causing grievous bodily harm.

Similar to men, women also have diverse motives for engaging in violence. The 2012 Initiative for Peace-Early Warning Cluster report on Youth, Identity and Security report cites a number of motivations for women and girls to engage in urban violence, motivations ranging from fulfilment of basic needs and support to families to the attainment of social recognition and feelings of belonging to adrenaline rushes. In some instances, this engagement in violence is used by women to liberate themselves from patriarchal norms and expectations. However, though this direct engagement in conflict provides temporary freedom as women overtly challenge patriarchal norms, women engaged in direct conflict may face an array of gender inequalities during combat and oftentimes their active role and/or post-conflict needs go neglected in transitions to peace where many are expected to retreat to traditionally ascribed roles. Further, women may be “stigmatised as violent and sexual – both unacceptable traits of a ‘normal’ woman.”

Nevertheless, even when women are not engaged in direct combat, they may play other aggressive roles in violent conflicts. The report Aggression in Women: Behavior, Brain and Hormones, highlights that women and girls often express aggression in passive-aggressive and supporting ways that do not necessarily directly inflict physical injury. This is evidenced in many conflicts where women play a role in rallying men, or perpetuating violent expressions of masculinities. Interpeace’s report I walk with the boys highlights how women supported the 2012 Northern Malian rebellion through savings to buy munition and other provisions for combatants as well as through the treat-
ment of the wounded.  
Saferworld’s report on *Masculinities, Conflict and Peacebuilding* states: “As the examples from South Sudan and Somalia demonstrate, women can put pressure on men to commit violence, thereby reinforcing dominant conceptions of violent masculinity which complement ideas of passive femininity. This phenomenon was also seen in Britain and the United States during the First World War, when women organized a campaign to give white feathers to men who had not enlisted in the armed forces as a means of marking them out as cowards.”
This type of indirect aggression has real consequences in embedding norms while prolonging and perpetuating cycles of conflict.

**Gender influences the types of vulnerabilities that individuals face before, during and after violent conflicts**

Although it is commonly argued that women and girls are disproportionately affected by violent conflict, this argument masks the profound impact that these conflicts have on individuals, families, communities and societies. While a 2006 study found that armed conflict, through direct and indirect consequences, kill more women than men, the 2015 Global Burden of Armed Violence report notes that it is challenging to establish figures of women killed in conflict settings. This is primarily due to the methodological and empirical challenges of measuring indirect deaths from conflict, which tend to be women. However, the 2011 and 2015 reports of the same study find that men are over 80% of victims of homicide (over 80%). Rather than discussing disproportionality, it is more helpful to look at the different vulnerabilities men and women face during violent conflicts.

---

**Note for Practitioners:**
Increasingly, peacebuilding interventions have recognized the importance of combining strategies for structural change (laws, policies, governance) with strategies catalysing cultural change (changes in behaviours and relationships). Understanding the social pressures that influence men and women’s engagement in direct violence and the relationship between masculinities, femininities and how they manifest in conflict dynamics, is important for developing strategies that aim at transforming how men and women behave and how they relate to each other to promote more peaceful expressions of masculinity and femininity for long-term peacebuilding.
The PROMUNDO and Oak Foundation’s report entitled “Masculine Norms and Violence: Making the Connection” mentions that “[men’s] violent deaths are not the only, or even a major proportion of, deaths associated with active conflict, however, and some data suggest that the majority of overall deaths associated with active conflict, when indirect consequences are considered, are women and children.” These consequences for both men, women, boys and girls include displacement, lack of access to resources, food insecurity, health risks, among others.

During times of conflict, because of the absence or targeting of men, women and girls may play roles from which they are traditionally excluded. For example, they may become the primary breadwinners and may take up leadership roles in their families and communities, both a source of emancipation and frustration. In a report on Somalia, Gardner and Bushra report that “While they may deplore men’s failures to provide for and protect them and their families, they also relish new opportunities...While many are happy to take on new roles, others are reaching breaking point, frustrated by their often khat-addicted adult male dependents and looking forward to the day when, they assume, men will resume their share of family responsibilities.”

Yet the post-conflict period often leaves these women vulnerable as they are expected to return to their previously patriarchally ascribed roles. They may find regressions in their civil liberties and exclusion from decision making processes. Their ability to access justice and fair resolution of their grievances may also be limited, particularly in post-conflict contexts where there is either a return to traditional justice mechanisms or the adoption of a dual justice system, traditional and state. A 2019 research conducted by Voz di Paz and Interpeace in Guinea Bissau found that despite a general appreciation for the role of traditional justice among both men and women, “traditional mechanisms of conflict resolution value and reinforce the subordination of women to their husbands, due to the importance

43 For example, it was reported that women in the Myanmar state of Karen began assuming the roles of village chiefs: ‘Burma/Myanmar: Conflict Pushes Karen Women to Be Village Chiefs’ <https://www.peacewomen.org/content/burmanayanmar-conflict-pushes-karen-women-be-village-chiefs> accessed 20 January 2020.
acceded to marriage; women, as well as children, are encouraged to resign themselves and accept decisions, even if perceived as unfair. However, participants in the study noted that circumventing these traditional mechanisms and going directly to formal justice institutions can both exacerbate conflict and reinforce resistance to women's rights.

Men also face specific vulnerabilities in the conflict and post-conflict period. For example, several scholars have noted that because conflict tends to disrupt social, political, economic and security systems, men in post-conflict periods may find themselves unable to fulfill traditionally masculine roles as providers for their family. As the United States Institute for Peace notes, "In crisis and post conflict settings, it can thus become increasingly difficult for many men—particularly young men—to fill their socially prescribed roles and functions." Green, Robles and Pawlak suggest that this is due to the fact that "During a conflict, men’s abilities to fulfill their social roles as protectors or providers are challenged by economic instability, livelihood destruction, and pending insecurity. In some cases, men migrate to urban centers where they are displaced from their communities and often cannot access formal markets to provide for themselves or their families." They go on to note that this “can leave men with, ‘either an eroded sense of manhood or the option of a militarised masculine identity’ where violence and killing help a man maintain a sense of power and control.”

Further, men who are displaced may feel a sense of disempowerment due to their displacement, lack of access to economic resources and inability to fulfill other expectations such as getting married and starting a family. Additionally, a 2016 Rift Valley Institute briefing paper on The impact of war on Somali men and its effects on the family, women and children points out that “dependency on International NGOs (INGOs) for food, shelter, children’s schooling and health care undermines men’s responsibility as decision-makers and providers for the family.” An exacerbating factor is the fact that the specific needs and vulnerabilities of men are often ignored in humanitarian and development interventions, leaving both men and women frustrated. According to USIP, frustrations with not being able to fulfill their role as men may lead to the “internalisation of violent norms, mental health issues, drug and alcohol abuse, and the fallout from sexual violence” among some men, which can subsequently have significant impacts on families and the broader communi-
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ties, particularly women and girls. These frustrations have been documented to be linked to increased domestic and gender-based violence as men try to regain control and positioning that they feel has been lost.

**Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**

It is widely recognised that women, girls and boys face specific vulnerabilities to sexual violence. And although it is difficult to estimate the rate of prevalence of sexual violence in conflict settings, the 2014 WHO global Status Report on Violence Prevention found that 30% of every partnered woman has been a victim of intimate partner violence, while one in five girls has been sexually abused during childhood. This is exacerbated in conflict settings where “mass rape of the enemy population’s women continues to be one of the most commonly used weapons of war.”

SGBV increases both during and after violent conflict not only because sexual violence is used as a means of warfare but also, as Bouta et al. assert, “because of the disruption of social order and traditional institutions in wartime, GBV—which would normally provoke strong community reactions and sanctions—frequently goes unpunished in conflict.” A 2018 UN report on Conflict Related Sexual Violence finds that “women heads of households or women migrating with children are particularly vulnerable to sexual violence by authorities, armed groups, smugglers or traffickers, as was observed in Iraq, Libya, Myanmar, Nigeria, Somalia and South Sudan.”

Further, as Bouta, Frerks and Bannon note in the 2005 report on Gender, Conflict, and Development, “GBV becomes an accepted practice that can continue after hostilities have ceased” and “seems to take place from the public to the private domain in the transition from conflict to peace.”

As early as 2000, Chris Dolan’s research in Northern Uganda found evidence of sexual violence against men and boys, upending the notion that only women and girls are victims of sexual violence. The 2018 UN report on Conflict Related Sexual Violence reports incidents against men, such as rape, gang rape, forced nudity and other forms of inhumane and degrading treatment. Violations against men were reported in Burundi, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Sudan, Sri Lanka and the Syrian Arab Republic, occurring primarily in villages and detention facilities. Yet as Heloise Goodley states, “there is a general misconception that men are immune from sexual violence, owing to gender stereotypes of women as weak and therefore victims, while men

---

are either the powerful protector or perpetrators of violence.”

This misconception is also linked to the prevalence of hegemonic masculine ideals. Because sexual victimisation is inconsistent with ideals of hegemonic masculinity, men who are victimised feel a sense of shame and risk stigmatisation in their community. Further, as a UN report notes: “there are often no legal provisions regarding the rape of men. Instead, the criminalization of adult consensual same-sex conduct may impede reporting for fear of prosecution, despite being a victim.”

Moreover, there is increasing awareness of how women, men, boys and girls are impacted by trauma from exposure to violence and how that trauma affects social, civic and economic participation, ultimately compromising individual and community well-being, as well as capacities for rebuilding healthy relationships in the aftermath of large scale conflict or violence. In the above section, the link between conflict and increases in domestic violence have been highlighted. Several reports have demonstrated significant economic consequences for women exposed to intimate partner violence. Further, as the WHO points out, “victims of violence are more likely to experience spells of unemployment, absenteeism, and to suffer health problems that affect job performance. Other indirect costs include those related to lost productivity because of premature death; long-term disability; the provision of places of safety for children and women; disruptions to daily life because of fears for personal safety; and disincentives to investment and tourism.” This is exacerbated by the fact that psychosocial support services are often limited, particularly in rural areas and during humanitarian crises.

### Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration

Men and women who have engaged in combat have specific needs as they disarm, demobilise and reintegrate into society. Although DDR programmes often target male combatants, a key ingredient that has been neglected has been the understanding and the transformation of militarised masculinities. As Saferworld’s report on masculinities states, “the militarisation of masculinities can also become an obstacle to former combatants integrating back into civilian life.” Participating in combat offers men a number of ways to achieve an ideal of manhood, including

---
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financial resources and power.

A 2006 report by the UN on Integrated disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration standards notes “finding alternatives to violent ways of expressing masculinity is vital in periods of transition from war to peace.”

As UN Women points out, the specific needs and experience of women actively engaged in conflict are often left out of DDR processes. Bouta, in a paper on Gender and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration, notes that “as female combatants are not directly regarded as a major security threat, they are insufficiently targeted by DDR programmes, as for instance was the case in Mozambique, Sierra Leone and various other countries.” Further, DDR programmes have tended to categorise women in armed groups as non-combatants, not taking into account the multiplicity of roles that can be played in armed conflict. This in essence leads to an erasure of women who were active participants in violence in processes of post-conflict peacebuilding and security reforms, compounding the vulnerabilities of these women who often face ostracism from their communities for going against gender norms. Fear of stigmatization prevented female combatants in Sierra Leone and Liberia for example from registering in DDR programmes.

Upreti et. al found that the DDR strategy in Nepal was largely gender blind, ignoring, among other needs, the psychosocial needs of women. This was despite reports of the stigmatisation faced by women formerly engaged in the Maoist movement, many of whom faced rejection from their families and communities partially due to the misconceived association of their engagement in combat with aggression and hyper-sexuality.

Further, where there are efforts for DDR specifically targeted at women, they risk reinforcing gender norms. For example, the 2015 UN Women report on Preventing Conflict, Transforming Justice and Security the Peace, notes that “female ex-combatants have often been limited to choosing between activities such as hairdressing and tailoring, both of which could expose them to a lifetime of low wages and poor working conditions.” These types of efforts are neither gender transformative nor do they alleviate the specific vulnerabilities faced by women previously engaged in combat. As Muzurana, Krystalli and Baare explain, that “In order to disarm, demobilize, and reintegrate former combatants, insti-
tutions and DDR managers need to understand female combatants’ diverse wartime roles and experiences, including why they joined armed groups in the first place; whether they joined voluntarily or by force; their roles and responsibilities within the group; their vulnerability to sexual violence or other abuses within the group; the likely challenges they will face during reintegration; whether the armed forces they were part of were ‘winners’ or ‘losers’ in the conflict; how long they have been away from the community; if they entered the fighting forces as children; and levels of community acceptance when fighters have broken societal norms and taboos.”

Note for Practitioners: Men, women, girls and boys face different and interlinked vulnerabilities during and after violent conflicts. In a peacebuilding context, it is important to address these vulnerabilities to prevent recurrent cycles of violence and provide alternatives for peace. Understanding the various experiences and impacts of conflict are integral for developing strategies that address the specific needs of different intersectional identities of women, men, boys and girls, in order to build societies more resilient to violent conflict.

Gender influences the capacities of resilience developed and exercised by individuals and groups in the face of violent conflict.

While there are obvious negative impacts of violence, conflicts also provide avenues for transformation of longstanding gender norms, some of which, have been instrumental in perpetuating long standing experiences of social and political exclusion in many societies. For example, Uwineza and Pearson note: “violence in Rwanda targeted primarily Tutsi men, whose death or flight left behind women and children. Women—married and widowed—were forced to adapt to difficult conditions by becoming farmers, tilling their land and growing food to sustain their families. An entire generation of exiled Tutsi Rwandans therefore grew accustomed to female-headed households and witnessed mothers, on their own, raising children. This generation later assumed power in post-conflict Rwanda and voiced an appreciation for women’s capabilities and recognition of the importance of women’s empowerment.”

Similar experiences have been witnessed in post conflict settings globally.

In some cases, these resilience capacities are based on established gender norms. As noted by Krause in a paper on Gender Dimensions of (Non)Violence in Communal Conflict: The Case of Jos, Nigeria, “…essentialist assumptions may allow women to use social practices not equally available to men. For example, women may conduct shuttle diplomacy and fulfill informal messenger roles that de-escalate communal relations even though male leaders may not officially communicate.” Such roles are played at the local level as highlighted in Interpeace’s research on Resilience for Reconciliation in the Great Lakes, where women in Kiwanja, North Kivu, DRC, took initiative to risk their safety to convince young men involved in a militia to disengage and retreat in order to allow communities to cultivate their land.

Women also play these roles at the higher level as evidenced by the women delegates to the 2002 Inter-Congolese Dialogue in Sun City who formed a human chain to block the exits insisting that Sun City Agreements be signed.

The Independent Progress Study on Youth, Peace and Security, found that “young men who are engaged in peacebuilding work may help increase its credibility among their peers, and the involvement of other young men who remain sceptical about how it contributes to their ‘manliness’ and image.”
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Sometimes these resilience capacities can commence as an extension of existing gender norms and evolve into opportunities for transformation. For example, in Interpeace’s *Documenting the Resilience of Liberians in the Face of Threats to Peace and the 2014 Ebola Crisis*, the research group found that women’s actions such as initiating community dialogues and developing solidarity agreements for economic development, as well as economic proactivity, were key to resilience against conflict and against the Ebola crisis. These actions were perceived to be extensions of women’s existing roles as caregivers and nurturers. However, as time passed, women highlighted the transformative nature of these activities, enabling them to have awareness and transforming their roles to include breadwinning and social mobilisation, particularly to call for increased gender equality. Understanding the transformative nature of these capacities is important as the study also found that the change in women’s roles was a potential conflict factor as it contributed to a sense of disempowerment among men. Moreover, as the study noted, “documenting and understanding the specific attributes of women’s resilience in a male dominated society is critical to addressing gender inequality as well as building lasting peace.”

**Note for Practitioners:**
Resilience capacities, similar to roles and vulnerabilities, are influenced by gender, age and other factors. Understanding the gendered nature of these resilience capacities and how they manifest in conflict and post-conflict settings can enable peacebuilders to harness and build upon these capacities to broaden peace agency and bring diverse actors into peacebuilding processes.

---


Gender norms impact how individuals and groups, participate in, influence and shape peace process

Despite the various documented contributions of women to catalysing peace agreements and other informal peace actions, “evidence shows that even in contexts where women played important political roles as peace activists during conflict or were fighting in rebel forces, they were often marginalized within the political settlement and being pushed out of public life and back into traditional roles after the conflict ended.” This exclusion not only limits opportunities for advancing gender equality but also addressing varied and diverse concerns in peace negotiations. A 2012 Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development (SeeD) and Interpeace research on Gender and Participation in Peace Talks found that women from both the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities had very specific fears regarding the negotiations in Cyprus, namely fear of post-solution economic failure, fear of identity erosion and fear of renewed conflict and domination by the other country.78 Not having women at the negotiation table limited opportunities for these specific concerns to be integrated into the overall negotiation process.

Women are not the only group often excluded from official and even unofficial peace processes. Men and boys may also face exclusion based on other identities such as ethnicity or social positioning. Young people, men, women, boys and girls, are also excluded, not only in peace processes but many other facets of societal participation, with important consequences for sustainable peace, including mistrust of governance structures, general apathy and engagement in alternative avenues of participation.79 This is despite the fact that, as the Independent Progress Study on Youth Peace and Security remarks, “a peace agreement’s endurance depends on whether the next generations accept or reject it, how they are socialized during the peace process, and their perceptions of what that peace process has achieved.” 80

It has become widely accepted that inclusion is important for sustainable peace. As the EU report on Inclusive Peacebuilding and Statebuilding in Emerging and Multicultural States asserts, “issues of ethnic and regional marginalisation, unequal access to economic and political opportunities, lack of voice in the political process and of influence on decisions affecting one’s own life, are common to most intra-state conflicts, which dominate the post-Cold War era. Failure to reduce inequality and enhance inclusive decision-making increases the likelihood of violence resuming.” 81 Yet lack of inclusivity is pervasive across

the world. Gender norms are among the drivers of this lack of inclusivity. Interpeace’s report “Fala di Mindjer” (The Voices of Women) which looked at the role of women in decision-making in Guinea Bissau found that the image of a successful Bissauan woman, one who is married, altruistic and privileges family over all else, leads to both structural and self-exclusion from political engagement and decision-making; those who do engage may face stigmas, defamation and questions around their capacity.82

Beyond the normative value of inclusivity, studies show a direct relationship between women’s meaningful participation and influence on peace and conflict: “For example, a cross national quantitative analysis found that higher levels of female participation in parliament reduce the risks of civil war. Another, using data on international crises over four decades, found that as the percentage of women in parliament increases by five percent, a state is five times less likely to use violence when faced with an international crisis.”83

Further, research conducted by Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative found that women’s inclusion, specifically the extent to which they have influence on peace processes, increased the likelihood of agreements being reached.84 For women to be effective, their mere presence was insufficient, while space to influence the decision-making process, coalition formation and mobilisation, and transfer strategies, among others, were much more important. A study conducted by Laurel Stone suggests that peace agreements are 35% more likely to last for 15 years if women are included women as witnesses, signatories, mediators, and/or negotiators in its creation.85 This is not due to their participation as such. O’Reilly, Suilleabhain and Paffenholz suggest it is because when women have the chance to influence peace processes, “they address issues relating to the causes and effects of conflict and frequently marry the three pillars of the United Nations (human rights, security, and development) in their approach. This can also be understood as bringing the concepts of ‘human security’ and ‘positive’ peace, which denotes the absence of structural violence and a reinforcement of those factors that sustain peace.”86 Their study also finds that the stronger the influence of women’s groups on peace agreements, the more likely the agreements were to be fully implemented.

Although there are no similar studies on the inclusion of youth and/or other marginalised or intersectional groups, the authors of the Progress Study on Youth Peace and Security suggest that “the inclusion of young people in peace processes can serve as the ‘connective social tissue’ that
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'integrates diverse engagements across multiple levels within a wider understanding of reconciliation strategies as both multi-faceted and non-linear'.”87

As Ban Ki Moon observed during his address to the Security Council on 8 October 2012, “political or economic exclusion, horizontal inequalities and discrimination undermine sustainable peace. A successful peacebuilding process must be transformative and create space for a wider set of actors – including, but not limited to, representatives of women, young people, victims and marginalized communities; community and religious leaders; civil society actors; and refugees and internally displaced persons – to participate in public decision-making on all aspects of post-conflict governance and recovery.”88

**Note for Practitioners:** The inclusion of women, men, boys and girls is often promoted through a normative lens. While it is important to adhere to standards of gender equality, real inclusion of women, men, boys and girls of different background has been demonstrated to improve the effectiveness of efforts to stop violence and build peace. However, research demonstrates that for gender inclusive processes to positively contribute to peacebuilding efforts, they must go beyond representation and include opportunities and strategies for influencing, strategies that specifically challenge and transform power for more equal decision-making. As O’Reilly, Suilleabhain and Paffenholz affirm, “When women participate and are able to exercise influence, there are positive effects for the likelihood of reaching a peace agreement, the text of the agreement that is produced, and the implementation that follows.”89

---


Challenges in Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding

The international community has widely accepted that gender inclusion and the advancement of gender equality are fundamental to the social changes sought in peacebuilding and development. Nevertheless, implementing gender inclusive peacebuilding programming presents several challenges that must be carefully managed. These challenges include:

- **Promoting transformation in gender norms and recognising that changes in gender norms can lead to and influence violent conflict:** Transformation in gender norms is integral for advancing meaningful gender inclusion in peacebuilding and decision-making. However, as noted above, these transformations can sometimes lead to increases in violence, both intimate partner violence and engagement in other acts of violence as a response to loss of privilege and power. Recognising this challenge compels peacebuilding practitioners to ensure that gender inclusive programming is conflict sensitive.

- **Addressing the historical marginalisation of women and recognizing the intersectionality of experiences of injustice and exclusion:** The exclusion and marginalisation and women is one of the most consistent and pervasive forms of exclusion globally. Nevertheless, exclusion can happen based on a number of intersectional identity markers. Truly gender inclusive programming must balance the need to address the historical marginalisation of women while also ensuring meaningful participation and influence of other marginalised and excluded groups.

- **Promoting women’s empowerment and focusing on masculinities:** Over the past two decades, gender equality programming has primarily focused on women’s empowerment, which has inadvertently excluded various groups of men and exacerbated the vulnerabilities of women to violence. As the role of masculinities in violence and the vulnerabilities of different groups of men are better understood, there has been an increased focus on masculinity, raising fears among women’s advocates that programming will again be male-centred and risk overshadowing the specific experiences, perspectives and needs of women. Balance and complementarity of women’s empowerment and masculinities programming is important to ensure that programming is truly gender inclusive, sensitive to the experiences and needs of various groups and providing an avenue of transformation of gender norms to create more equal gender relations.

- **Promoting inclusivity and accepting that not everyone can be included at every step of the peacebuilding process:** Gender inclusive programming, particularly programming sensitive to intersectionality, requires bringing diverse voices into peacebuilding and statebuilding processes. Nevertheless, some processes necessitate working with smaller, discrete groups to reach specific objectives. In these circumstances, it becomes difficult to have the representation and participation of all groups. However, official participation is not the only form of inclusion and inclusive peacebuilding programmes must seek to find avenues to bring different perspectives and experiences into the official processes, even in those
instances where there are limited seats at the table.

- **Challenging practices of exclusion and marginalisation and accompanying locally driven processes when gender and other sources of exclusion do not emerge as “priorities”:** Despite their influence on conflict dynamics, gendered and other inequalities can be so deeply embedded in cultural norms that addressing these inequalities may not emerge as explicit priorities for building long-term peace. Yet experience has shown that true transformation requires buy-in and leadership by local actors. It is important that gender inclusive peacebuilding programming ensures that issues of inequalities are addressed but also that these efforts are locally led.

**Note for Practitioners:** This practice note does not intend to resolve these challenges. For practitioners, recognising these challenges is a first step for conflict sensitive and gender inclusive programming. Developing strategies for navigating these challenges presents opportunities for learning and innovation in programming. Engaging multiple stakeholders around these challenges can enable practitioners to find optimal solutions for navigating these challenges. What is most important is for practitioners to neither ignore nor be discouraged by these challenges, but to face these challenges head on to improve gender inclusivity in peacebuilding programming.
Ten Foundations for Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding Practice

Sexual and gender minorities

This practice paper primarily discusses the roles, vulnerabilities, resilience capacities and participation in peacebuilding processes of men, women, boys and girls. As highlighted in the definition of intersectionality, this categorisation is insufficient to capture the diversity of the experiences of individuals in conflict settings. Sexual and Gender Minorities (SGM) face specific challenges in conflict settings, challenges that do not always emerge in normative texts, conflict analysis and other foundational documents that guide peacebuilding interventions. As Hagen notes regarding the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) architecture, including within the eight UN Security Council resolutions, there is no focused attention on the lives and needs of SGM. Yet, studies have demonstrated that SGM may face exacerbated vulnerabilities due to pre-existing social discrimination, such as targeted violence, policing of gender norms, blackmail and extortion and rejection by family, often “underpinned by legal, social and ideological narratives and forms of exclusion, which may reduce or deny them access to the services or rights provided to other citizens,” services that are already limited in conflict settings. Furthermore, evidence suggests that male SMG victims of sexual violence in particular may not even know nor be inclined to seek out services they perceive as being provided solely for female survivors. Beyond this, a large number of countries criminalize same-sex sexual practices and minority gender identities, rendering it more challenging for individuals to either receive services and/or be purposefully engaged in peace building efforts. Moreover, in post-conflict settings where there is a nostalgia for a heteronormative past, this romanticizing of the past can be used not only to reinforce gender inequality between men and women but also to render SGM invisible and/or targeted.

Addressing the needs and creating opportunities for more inclusion of SGM is an important part of a gender inclusive peacebuilding approach. Fidelma Ashe, in Reimaging inclusive security in peace processes: LGB&T perspectives states that this requires “analysts to challenge statist interpretations of security and reimagine security as including different forms of power and different models of human insecurity,” models that take into account “how an individual’s multiple social

90 Myrttinen and Daigle note that “While variations of LGBTI (e.g. LGBT, LGBT&Q, LGBTIQ or LGBTQ) are common in primarily, but not exclusively, Western discourses, these are not universally accepted.” (https://www.international-alert.org/sites/default/files/Gender_SexualAndGenderMinorities_EN_2017.pdf) Saferworld proposes that “Sexual and gender minorities (SGMs) is an umbrella term which refers to people whose sexual orientation or gender identity does not fit within conventional societal norms.” In this document, we use the term sexual and gender minority to more inclusively capture a diversity of experiences and identities. (https://www.saferworld.org.uk/downloads/pubdocs/ gender-analysis-of-conflict-toolkit.pdf)
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identities compound the risk of violence against them." 95 It is equally important to recognize the sensitivity required in working with SGM communities and on SGM issues. Beyond the social, legal and political resistance, there is a risk of exposure to exacerbated violence through possible “outing” of individuals who may or may not identify as belonging to these categorisations. For this reason, a “do no harm” approach is critical. However, as Henri Myrttinen and Megan Daigle assert in the International Alert report *When merely existing is a risk*: “doing no harm should, however, not be taken to mean doing nothing, unless the risks are too great. Thus, peacebuilders aiming to work on these issues need to inform themselves and coordinate closely with pre-existing SGM rights organisations and networks in-country, listen to and address their needs and concerns, but also avoid ‘squeezing out’ these local initiatives.” 96

In this practice paper, we approach gender through an intersection lens, understanding that individuals have complex identities that shape their experience of conflict and participation in peacebuilding. The 10 Foundations, applied through this intersectional lens, provide guidance for peacebuilding that is inclusive of all individuals and the varied identities, including gendered identities.
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Ten Foundations for Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding Programming

In 2019, Interpeace embarked on a process to document its experience in implementing gender inclusive peacebuilding programming. The aim of this process was to draw out lessons to guide the design and implementation of Interpeace’s efforts towards advancing gender inclusive peacebuilding both in its programming and policy engagement. The following ten foundations were identified through a series of programmatic and institutional reflections. Some foundations reflect best practices that were identified across one or more contexts. Other foundations reflect gaps identified by Interpeace staff and partners. Finally, a literature review of peacebuilding programming evaluations, particularly as they relate to the gender sensitivity and responsiveness of interventions generated foundations that were not identified as part of Interpeace’s reflections.

The ten foundations are intended to provide an overall framework and guidance for programme design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. The ten foundations are complementary and are not necessarily exhaustive. Contextual and funding constraints may restrict the extent to which the ten foundations are practiced in a given programme, country or region. Nevertheless, gradual adoption of the ten foundations are expected to lead to meaningful change that enables gender inclusion to contribute to sustainable and effective peacebuilding and that enables peacebuilding efforts to create opportunities for advancing gender equality.

Interpeace’s project “Advocates for peace and security: Increasing young women’s participation in community security and the implementation of UNSCR 1325 in the West Bank”, implemented in partnership with The Freedom Theatre between 1 March 2018 and 31 December 2018
Foundation One: Strengthen the capacity of staff, partners and stakeholders to analyse gender and to design and implement gender inclusive interventions

The effective application of policies and guidance are contingent upon the will and the capacity of an organization to put them into practice. Developing a guidance note is one step in demonstrating organizational will, and the value an organization attaches to enhancing gender programming. A recent Independent Thematic Review on Gender for the UN Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) recommends the “PBSO to prioritise the development of clear and practical ‘how to’ guides on critical themes and tools of gender-responsive peacebuilding for the accompaniment process at country level to help programme managers/staff and intended beneficiaries translate commitments into meaningful actions and programmes. This could help enhance effectiveness and impact of projects and strategies.”97 This recommendation is relevant for all organizations seeking to enhance their gender-responsive programming. In the case of Interpeace, the development of a Gender Practice Note, focused on inclusion, which directly links the practice of gender to the organization’s change framework and principles is a promising first step.

Yet, an organization’s staff can only implement a guidance to the extent that they have capacity to do so. The above-mentioned PBSO thematic review observes that such training should demonstrate “how to integrate gender in all steps of the PBF process – identification and design of project, consultations with partners and beneficiaries, gender budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting on results and impact.”98 Equipping the staff, partners and stakeholders engaged in these programmes will be necessary for designing good strategies, implementing effective programming and monitoring and evaluating gendered impacts of programming.

Results of Interpeace’s 2019 Gender Reflection
Interpeace’s teams and partners in Burundi, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Palestine and Somalia held reflection sessions between February and July 2019 to identify lessons learned, best practices and recommendations for improving gender programming. Across these five contexts as well as in three institutional reflections, capacity building through training and accompaniment was consistently identified as a key need for enhancing the staff’s ability to design, implement and monitor and evaluate gender in Interpeace’s peacebuilding programming. Staff remarked that this training was not only important for the institution but also its partners and the stakeholders, particularly women it interacts with from the community to the international levels.
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Conflict analysis is an integral component of peacebuilding programming. As the CDA Collaborative Learning Projects (OH) Conflict Analysis Framework: Field Guidelines and Procedures notes, “conflict analysis is a crucial tool for the design, implementation and evaluation of peacebuilding programmes—whether for the prevention of armed conflict, attempting to bring war and violence to an end, to help societies recover in the aftermath of war, or to attain greater justice and equality.”

Conflict analysis looks at the actors and stakeholders, issues or problems, structural causes and triggers of violence. The guidance goes on to explain that “in order to reflect several dimensions of the conflict and open additional ways of taking preventive action, a conflict analysis should be informed from a gender perspective.”

Integrating gender, ideally during the design phase, but at any phase of programming relies on the quality and depth of an application of a gendered lens to the conflict analysis.

As mentioned in the overview on why gender is important in peacebuilding, both conflict and resilience are influenced by gender. Interpeace has increasingly brought attention to the importance of understanding resilience capacities in order to inform holistic peacebuilding programming. As such, a gender conflict analysis should also include a gendered assessment of resilience capacities.

Further, in her article How Should We Explain the Recurrence of Violent Conflict, and What Might Gender Have to Do with It? El-Bushra explains that “applying a relational and intersectional understanding of gender to conflict analysis permits important insights into its social, psychosocial, and cultural, as well as political and economic, dimensions to be incorporated into peacebuilding strategies and practice.” Applying a gender lens will enable conflict (and resilience) analyses to inform programming, taking into account how gender influences conflict dynamics, the role actors of different gender identities play in conflict, the vulnerabilities faced by those of different gendered identities and the resilience capacities of different actors. Gendered conflict analysis, conflict analysis which analyses the causes/drivers, consequences and resilience capacities as they relate to the lived experiences of stakeholders of different genders is vital to understanding the situation for boys, girls, women and men and for developing appropriate programming strategies that are responsive to their vulnerabilities and that create spaces for their meaningful inclusion in peacebuilding processes.
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Analysing the Gender Dynamics of Mistrust of Security and Defence Forces (SDF) in Mali

From 2013 to 2014, the Institute Malian de Recherche-Action pour la Paix (IMRAP) and Interpeace conducted a participatory conflict analysis to identify the challenges to peace in Mali. One of the main obstacles to peace that emerged from the consultation of 4,700 Malians is the recurrence of unresolved conflicts. A key factor in this is that communities often lack trust in government institutions and their representatives, such as the defence and security forces. Progressive research efforts pointed to a need to better understand the mistrust of security and defence forces from a gender perspective, specifically (i) improving trust between women and the SDF and (ii) promoting women’s participation in the defence and security forces in Mali.

Based on consultations with over 3000 Malians, it emerged that the integration of women in defence and security forces was perceived to create favourable conditions for building trust between the population and these forces. This is because women in uniform elicit less fear and women in particular feel more comfortable engaging directly with women in the defence and security forces, particularly, but not exclusively, in cases of SGBV. However, the research also found that women were faced with several obstacles to joining the armed forces, among them societal rejection, balancing multiple priorities and conditions that did not consider their specific gender needs.
Foundation Three: Build intersectoral linkages and connect with organizations working explicitly on gender

In their article on *Gender Equality in Peacebuilding and Statebuilding*, Domingo and Holmes identify several entry points for gender-responsive peacebuilding and statebuilding. Among these entry points is to “move away from siloed and technical approaches to sector programming. In statebuilding, what happens in one sphere of political, social or economic engagement affects change processes and opportunities/challenges for gender issues in another - and all affect the quality of state society relations.” 103 Green, Robles and Pawlak further urge to “challenge the general presumption that public policies are gender neutral, and directly acknowledge and address the gender norms that limit men’s life choices and chances.” This relates to women as well. Macro-level structures and systems have significant gendered impacts. A multi-and-intersectoral approach is imperative to address structural vulnerabilities, catalyse the behavioural change and harness the resilience capacities of individuals of different gender identities. Such an approach can ensure meaningful gender inclusion as well as deepen and broaden impact.

Equally as important for organizations focused on peacebuilding is to partner with women’s, men’s and youth organizations promoting gender equality for broader engagement and greater impact. While referencing their work in emergency response, Care International notes that they tended to select partners based on expertise related to emergency response and less for expertise or experience in gender, whereas these experiences, including advocacy, social mobilisation and psychosocial support, are critical both from gender transformation and emergency response. 104 For peacebuilding organizations with many foci, this is an important lesson. Partnering with women’s, men’s and youth organizations not only yields results on gender inclusivity, it brings other skills that are necessary for enhancing overall peacebuilding programming. Further, the 2019 OECD Development Policy Paper on *Engaging with Men and Masculinities in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Settings* notes, that in the face of concerns that working on masculinities might lead to a reduction of opportunities for work on women’s empowerment, women’s rights movements and progressive organizations working on engaging with men and masculinities. Among multiple strategies, they propose meaningful consultation of women’s rights organizations in different stages of project cycles as a mechanism for continued accountability for women. 105

---


Coalition Building for Social Change in Guinea Bissau

The historical exclusion of women in decision-making and resistance to changing roles and increased participation has been recognised as one of the root causes of conflict in Guinea-Bissau. Voz di Paz and Interpeace have been working together to transform this dynamic through a project entitled “Towards a new balance in Guinea-Bissau: creating the space for a real participation of women in peaceful conflict management and in governance”. The project aims to strengthen women’s participation (in governance and mediation) in the decision-making spheres at the national and local levels.

Voz di Paz and Interpeace have purposefully engaged CSOs working on women’s rights in this initiative. Key results of this engagement have been more nuanced understanding of gender among these CSOs and more constructive and participatory discussions on gender at all levels. Prior to the project, the language used to promote gender equality raised fears of exclusion of men. Slogans such as “it’s the women’s turn” blocked constructive discussion on gender equality. Voz di Paz and Interpeace’s approach worked with civil society and government actors to change the language around gender equality adopting a new slogan, “together, we have to go together.” This conciliatory slogan was better received by actors from the community to the national levels and created an opening for recognition of and discussion on the need for women’s participation in governance. These discussions have borne fruit, as evidenced by the 2019 change in government where there was gender parity in ministerial positions held by men and women. Further, the portfolios held by women included fisheries, territorial administration and electoral management, foreign affairs, agriculture and forestry, portfolios of importance that are globally traditionally held by men.

By working together with other actors in the society, Voz di Paz and Interpeace were able to broaden the debate around women’s participation and lay the foundation for long-term support for women’s inclusion in decision-making.
Foundation Four:  
Create safe spaces and opportunities for marginalised and excluded groups to voice their vulnerabilities and needs, to transform themselves in the aftermath of conflict and to develop confidence and capacity for effective engagement in peacebuilding and decision-making

True systemic change stems from the presence of women, men, girls and boys in peacebuilding and decision-making processes, but also in their ability to articulate and advocate for responses to their specific needs and interests. Yet historical experiences of marginalization and exclusion as well as experiences during and after conflict may impact the ability of some men, women, girls and boys to effectively engage in peacebuilding or in decision-making at various levels.

A recommendation from the *Living Peace: From Conflict to Coping in Democratic Republic of Congo*, EMERGE Case Study 7 is to “create safe spaces for men and women to discuss their traumas, in accessible, locations within the community, ensuring confidentiality.” 106 This recommendation emerged from experiences in implementing group therapy with men in North and South Kivu. Safe spaces enable those affected by conflict and violence, whether as perpetrators or as victims or as both, to heal from their trauma. Because trauma is extremely sensitive, creating “safe spaces” may require having separate spaces for men and women to enable them to discuss experiences of violence, particularly sexual violence. Healing is an important step in preparing individuals to engage initiatives to build peace and influence decisions.

In societies where masculinities are epitomised with ‘strength’ and where public displays of vulnerability are looked down upon, the creation of safe spaces is essential to understand and address male vulnerabilities and resilience. The same is true for women who might not feel comfortable discussing their experiences, vulnerability and resilience in front of male crowds. Similarly, perpetrators of violence are unlikely to be completely open about their experiences out of shame or fear for persecution.

Adopting new expressions of masculinity (or femininity) can be challenging for individuals living in highly patriarchal societies; it can be particularly difficult for those who have been previous engaged in violence. The UN’s introduction to Integrated DDR remarks that “providing young people with safe spaces to meet off the street where they can experience non-violent excitement can encourage the reintegration of young ex-combatants and other alienated youth into civil society by allow-
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ing them to meet with other people of their age in a non-military environment.” The UN Women Self-Learning Booklet: Understanding Masculinities and Violence Against Women and Girls goes further to suggest the strategy of “safe spaces” for men to enable men to “learn more about issues of masculinity and violence, ask questions without being judged or feeling ignorant, where they can participate without feeling threatened by expressing their concern for ‘women’s issues’, and can reflect on their own attitudes about women and violence.”

Successful engagements that promote and advance gender inclusivity must not only create spaces for inclusion, but also prepare women, boys, girls and marginalised men to effectively engage in spaces from which they are traditionally excluded. Because of historical marginalisation across the world, studies have noted the need to create safe spaces for women to build confidence and to be able to engage in peacebuilding or decision-making in statebuilding. Examples of this include Peace Huts in Liberia that enabled women “to come together to mediate and resolve community disputes,” and important development in a deeply patriarchal society. Similarly, safe spaces can provide women with the opportunity to practice leadership and engagement in community decision-making, preparing them for future political participation.

Facilitating Safe Spaces for Young Women in Burundi to Identify and Advocate for their Priorities

Since 2007, Interpeace and the Centre d’Alerte et de Prévention des Conflits (CENAP) have been jointly implementing a long-term peacebuilding programme to support violence prevention, reconciliation, conflict resolution and political dialogue in Burundi. Between 2015 and 2017, CENAP and Interpeace carried out a participatory research that consulted over 4000 young people across Burundi to identify “Youth Aspirations for a future Burundi.” The results of the research found, among other things, that 61% of boys and 45% of girls reported believing that boys deserved more decision-making responsibilities than girls. The results catalysed an additional participatory process to understand the specific needs and priorities of young women.

Among the activities conducted by the programme was the convening 50 young women from across Burundi, representing diverse backgrounds, to understand their concerns as the girls and young women themselves see it. The programme staff noted that having

separate spaces for girls to share their specific experiences and develop collective priorities and action points facilitated a level of engagement that had not been observed in mixed spaces. This was useful for understanding the needs and interests of girls and young women, addressing these needs requires engagement with a broader spectrum of society, including decision-makers, women, men and boys. A Gender Policy Forum bringing together these young women with the Ministries of Youth, Sports and Culture, Gender, Education and Employment, as well as members of women’s organizations, provided a space for girls to engage directly with decision-makers and preliminary activities enabled them to build the capacity, talking points and confidence to profoundly participate in this dialogue.
Foundation Five:

Work on masculinities and engage men and boys to understand their gender specific sources of vulnerability and resilience, address gendered drivers of violent conflict, strengthen gender resilience against violent conflict and promote women’s empowerment and gender equality

Gender concerns men, women, girls and boys, their differences and their relationships. Promoting positive manifestations of these gender identities and transforming norms that guide relationships between groups to be more inclusive is integral in the quest for broader social transformation in order to build more peaceful societies.

As highlighted above, gender influences the causes of conflict, the experiences of conflict, vulnerabilities resulting from conflict and resilience capacities developed in conflict contexts. As Naujoks and Ko note in the 2018 International Alert Policy Brief Mandating Men: Understanding masculinities and engaging men for equality and peacebuilding in Myanmar, “Understanding masculinities is important, because these masculinity norms – these social expectations – can be mobilised to manipulate the taking of violent actions.” Understanding is the first step that requires additional purposeful strategies for valorising masculinities that promote peaceful behaviour and transforming masculinities that push men towards violence. These efforts should also aim at addressing the specific vulnerabilities of men in post-conflict settings to transform vicious cycles of frustration and violence into reinforcing cycles of peace and equality. Additionally, efforts to transform must also work with women, recognising the role some women play in perpetuating expressions of masculinities that promote violence and inequality. Barker and Ricardo affirm that “girls and women can contribute to traditional, harmful versions of manhood, just as boys and men can contribute to traditional, restrictive versions of womanhood.” Moreover, Promundo advocates for looking at the transformation of masculinities beyond the lens of individual or community changes to address structural and political factors that influence men’s engagement in violence.
It is important to recognise that in many conflict and post-conflict settings the historical and cultural exclusion of women and girls make it imperative to focus gender inclusion efforts on integrating women and girls and transforming masculinities. Because masculinities and femininities are intrinsically linked, buy-in, support and engagement of men and boys is also integral to the success and sustainability of efforts towards gender inclusion. A 2013 International Labour Office working paper on *Men and Masculinities: Promoting Gender Equality in the World of Work* explains: “Men and boys are thus, in several ways, gatekeepers for gender equality and should be targeted and included in efforts to promote gender equality so as to ensure men’s support and partnership.” As Barker and Ricardo note, “true and lasting changes in gender norms will only be achieved when it is widely recognized that gender is relational, that it is short-sighted to seek to empower women without engaging men, and that is difficult if not impossible to change what manhood means without also engaging young women.”

The 2019 OECD report on men and masculinities in fragile and conflict-affected states highlights three approaches to working with men on efforts towards gender equality. These are: “Involving men is the least ambitious approach and seeks to bring in men as participants and/or expose them to topics that they would not usually get involved in themselves. Engaging men goes further and seeks to have men dynamically participate in activities they might otherwise not participate in (e.g. childcare) or dissuade them from behaviours they currently display, such as violence in the home. Transformative approaches go further and seek to change significantly the ways in which men and boys relate to themselves and others in society.” In the context of long-term peacebuilding, transformative approaches are necessary not only to prevent increases in violence against women as a result of women’s empowerment programmes but to change gender relations as part of wider social change to create conditions for sustainable peace.


Foundation Six: Utilize participatory processes and creative approaches to promote meaningful inclusion of women, men, boys and girls

As presented above, there is a “substantial link between women’s meaningful involvement in efforts to prevent, resolve and rebuild from conflict and the effectiveness and long-term sustainability of such efforts.”116 While there have not been as extensive of studies on the engagement of other actors across other identity markers, there is a general acceptance that inclusion is foundational for successful and sustainable peacebuilding.

While the concept of meaningful inclusion has yet to be fleshed out, the concept of meaningful participation serves as a valuable starting point to understanding what inclusion would look like. The 2018 Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Women’s Meaningful Participation in Negotiating Peace and the Implementation of Peace Agreements describes the concept of meaningful participation as: “multifaceted set of elements to realize the tangible and urgent demands that women not only be present, but that their concerns are heard and taken on board, they have the opportunity to articulate their contributions and expertise, to ensure that gender perspective and analyses inform and shape peace processes, and that outcomes benefit the whole of society.”117 Thus, meaningful participation and, by extension, inclusion, is not just about quantitative representation, but about four critical elements: agency in agenda setting, self-efficacy to represent interests, presence to harness opportunities to inform and engage and exerting influence on transformation processes.118 While this definition refers to women, it can equally be applied to other excluded groups.

Participatory approaches, such as Participatory Action Research and inclusive dialogue, which are often used to engage different groups in peacebuilding initiatives, can be leveraged to more purposefully create space for the meaningful inclusion of excluded groups of women, men, girls and boys. Reflections in Interpeace’s programmes have confirmed what many research studies have also found, the “add women and stir” approach does not work for meaningful inclusion. While it serves as a space for quantitative representation in research and dialogue activities, it rarely provides a space for gender specific needs, vulnerabilities, priorities and capacities to emerge. Some of the efforts that Interpeace programmes have employed include: separate gender discussions prior to or alongside mixed discussions; participatory conflict analysis/participatory action research focused on gender to bring out gender dynamics of conflict; providing conditions for parents to attend meeting and events with small children, and ensuring that dialogue groups have a combination of facilitators of different genders who can not only prepare
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people to engage effectively, but to then provide comfort for all to participate, actively, in whatever format that might be.

Additionally, creative approaches that foster participation, such as the use of arts, sports, socio-cultural activities and other non-conventional peacebuilding methodologies can be employed to more effectively engage different groups of women, men, girls and boys and to promote their meaningful participation and inclusion. For example, the 2018 UN Practice Note on Youth Peace and Security highlights Sports for Development and Peace (SDP) as a celebrated strategy for engaging youth. The practice states that “sport can be an effective tool in situations of conflict, as it reaches populations that might otherwise be hesitant to engage in traditional peacebuilding activities.”

Note on Youth Peace and Security highlights

Sports for Development and Peace (SDP) as a celebrated strategy for engaging youth. The practice states that “sport can be an effective tool in situations of conflict, as it reaches populations that might otherwise be hesitant to engage in traditional peacebuilding activities.”

Catholic Relief Service’s Laletek Project Manual on Strategic Community Peacebuilding in Practice paper highlights art, dance and community theatre as other tools to engage youth and harnessing their creativity for peacebuilding.

### Engaging young women in Palestine in peace and security through arts

Women in Palestine face numerous barriers and obstacles to access and participate in community security processes. Throughout daily life, women occupy very different spaces than men. They are subject to increasing social controls due to the prevalence of a weak state, an occupying power, and patriarchal gender arrangements. Young women face double discrimination due to their gender and their age. Although Palestine has a National Action Plan (NAP) for the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women Peace and Security, Because of the barriers and obstacles young women face in their everyday lives and the limited implementation of the NAP, young women have not been able to fully capitalise on the transformative potential of UNSCR 1325 as a tool for advocating a greater role for themselves in community security processes. In this context, Interpeace’s Palestine programme (Mustakbalna) implemented in 2018 the “Advocates for peace and security” project that sought to increase young women’s technical knowledge of UNSCR 1325 and human rights frameworks as well as build up their confidence and advocacy skills to allow them to voice their concerns and aspirations to decision-makers.

The project recognised the importance of strengthening the skills and capacities of young women to enable them to participate and influence community security processes in line with UNSCR 1325. It created safe spaces to understand the challenges faced by young women and to provide training and capacity building. The project then gave young women the space to shape their efforts for community engagement around their priorities, security concerns and overall role in peace and conflict. These efforts included street theatre, photography exhibitions, video screenings...

---


and information sessions. These activities also helped to build the young women’s confidence, preparing them for engaging decision-makers and community members on sensitive challenges such as risks of exposure to sexual violence.

Through these efforts, the project provided space for young women to actively participate in the promotion of the Women Peace and Security agenda, a space traditionally dominated by older women, particularly established civil society activists. It also allowed for young women to be viewed as active peace agents, not just passive victims.

Any number of participatory and creative strategies can be used to ensure real inclusion of actors across gender and other identities. What is important is that these strategies are locally appropriate and purposefully seek to provide those who are often excluded from peacebuilding and decision-making processes with representation and voice as well as opportunities for influence.
Foundation Seven: Ensure efforts to promote gender inclusion in peacebuilding are locally led and contextually adapted

Recognising that changes to gender norms can be innately conflictual, it is imperative to adapt approaches to the promotion of gender inclusion to be relevant for the contexts in which programmes are implemented. Key to that adaptation and the effectiveness of any efforts is the engagement and leadership of local actors themselves in the pursuit of gender inclusivity. Local actors must be in the driver’s seat of transformation around gender norms and identities.

It has been widely recognized that the sustainability of peacebuilding efforts and gains depends on the local ownership. However, the concept of local ownership is one with varied definitions and divergence around its application. What is certain is that, as explained in the Interpeace Policy Paper on Local Leadership to Local Ownership: An Essential Element for Effective Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention notes, “the hard-learnt experience of many years of peacebuilding research and practice is that peace needs to emerge from within a society and cannot be “imposed” by external actors, nor can it be ‘imported’ from other experiences.”121 This is particularly important as it relates to linking peacebuilding and transformation towards gender equality.

As explained in previous sections, the changing of gender roles, particularly in a post-conflict context can lead to frustrations around meeting gendered expectations, resentment and sentiments of marginalisation which can consequently lead to increased violence and perpetuate cycles of conflict. Over the past 30 years, the International community’s push for gender equality has borne fruit in the advancement of opportunities and empowerment of various groups, and women in particular. Yet this has not come without challenges. Among the persistent challenge are the various interests among some men and women to maintain the status quo of unequal gender relations. Consequently, the international community’s efforts to promote gender equality can be often perceived as externally driven and that changes to gender norms and relations are “imposed” by actors from the global north and are in direct confrontation with local values. Interpeace programmes in Guinea Bissau, Mali, Somalia, Palestine and Burundi, among others, have noted that this tension has been a significant challenge to inclusive gender peacebuilding programming. These tensions can limit the effectiveness of programming and, as has been demonstrated in the section above, lead to negative consequences for the specific groups on whose behalf the programming is undertaken.

Anchoring efforts towards gender equality and peacebuilding in local realities, working with key local actors, and adapting approaches to ensure contextual relevance can help in navigating complexities. Interpeace experience in Mali has demonstrated that in some contexts the argument of human and women’s rights does not resonate with the wider public. In such circumstances,

121 Local Leadership to Local Ownership: An Essential Element for Effective Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention. Policy Note No. 1. Interpeace, 2015
it is important to tailor messaging to allow for the internalisation of values of gender equality and to engage in constructive dialogue and action to promote gender inclusivity in peacebuilding and governance. Actors from the contexts in question are best placed to advise on how to contextualise messaging and effectively engaging the public to support efforts towards gender inclusion. Further, it is important to anchor gender inclusive programming in ongoing locally led efforts to promote gender inclusivity in order to mitigate risks of undermining and setting back existing progress made by individuals, groups and institutions within a given context. The above-referenced policy paper states that “enabling local leadership is about empowering social and political actors to engage in deliberative processes, supporting social and political institutions that permit collaboration and dialogue, and providing assistance in a way that ensures technical knowledge takes root in society and is shared by actors across the social and political divides.” Applying this understanding to the work on gender inclusion in peacebuilding means:

- Privileging local understanding in conflict analysis and placing emphasis on the concerns and priorities of diverse groups of women, men, girls and boys;
- Identifying local resources (individuals, infrastructures, organizations) that can contribute to initiatives and engage them in the design and refinement of interventions;
- Leveraging and valorising local expertise, especially individuals and organizations with expertise in promoting gender equality;
- Providing opportunities for a range of social actors to increase knowledge and expertise in advancing gender inclusion;
- Supporting local actors to take the lead in guiding the transformation process.
Women-led advocacy for women’s participation in statebuilding

Since the 2012 transfer of power from the transitional government to the Federal Government of Somalia, Somalia has been on a positive statebuilding trajectory that has renewed public optimism for greater stability in Somalia. Somali women have played a largely unrecognised but integral role in advancing peacebuilding and statebuilding. This includes mobilising for parties in conflict to negotiate, sign peace agreements and come to consensus. In Puntland for example, women used poetry and simple messages to mobilise clan elders to resolve the conflicts. Throughout the Somali region, women have been key to building the momentum that resulted in the establishment of government structures at local, regional and federal levels.

Despite the significant role they have played in driving peace, the representation, participation and role of women in formal political decision-making processes remain limited. Efforts by the international community and key Somali gender advocates to promote quotas and other mechanism for women’s participation continue to be met with resistance or inertia. In 2004, key gender advocates, led by Asha Haji Elmi launched the Sixth Clan movement which resulted in the 12% quota for women in the Transitional Federal Parliament (TFP). Although the fulfilment of this modest quota was not fulfilled, the movement inspired Somali women-led initiative to increase women’s participation and leadership in politics, resulting in the representation of women in the Lower (24%) and Upper Houses (22%) in 2017, a stark increase from previous election cycles.

The momentum at the Federal level has inspired similar efforts at the State level. In the lead-up to the 2019 parliamentary elections, the Puntland Development and Research Centre (PDRC), Interpeace’s long-term partner, launched an initiative to advocate for the implementation of a 30% quota for women’s participation. In collaboration with key Puntland gender advocates and groups as well as the Ministry of Women Development and Family Affairs (MoWDAFA), PDRC mapped out potential collaborators, held consultative meetings, developed and submitted a position paper to the then President Abdiwali Ali Gaas, and engaged in ongoing advocacy for a presidential decree for the implementation of the quota.

In October 2018, President Abdiwali issued a decree which, among other things, included a call for the implementation of the 30% quota. Although only one woman was subsequently elected into parliament, the effort by PDRC and other local actors has set a foundation for continued promotion of gender inclusion in decision-making structures.
Foundation Eight:
Integrate gender into monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks, activities and tools to generate more evidence on the impact of gender inclusive programming

Effective monitoring and evaluation that generates evidence on what is working, what needs to be improved and what impacts are catalysed through peacebuilding programming is essential to integrating gender inclusivity. Purposeful integration of gender in project theories of change, in indicators for measuring performance, in ongoing monitoring and in evaluative exercises can make a case in identifying best practices for advancing gender inclusivity as well as in demonstrating how gender inclusivity enhances the impact and sustainability of peacebuilding efforts.

A key challenge for enhancing gender inclusive peacebuilding programming is the lack of evidence to inform initiatives. Peacebuilding programming in general presents challenges for monitoring and evaluation since effective interventions do not necessarily follow a linear path as they continuously adapt to contextual changes. Additionally, these programmes may focus on changes at several levels, from behavioural change at the individual level to policy changes at the structural level. Monitoring and evaluating gender inclusion in peacebuilding presents compounded challenges. In the absence of comprehensive gendered conflict analyses, identifying what to measure can be difficult. Further, International Alert’s report Measuring Gender in Peacebuilding: Evaluating Peacebuilding efforts from a gender-relational perspective notes that neither gender nor peace are easily measured or quantifiable. This requires creative approaches to measure changes that are challenging to see but contribute significantly to long-term transformation.

Moreover, both peacebuilding and advancing gender equality are long term processes, rendering it difficult to measure and report on broad transformations during limited programming periods. Because the promotion of gender equality is often resisted by some of the most powerful stakeholders in society or seen as a low priority issue, changing gender norms and power dynamics can be a slow process. Many of the changes that peacebuilding organizations are striving to create lie outside of their spheres of influence and necessitate the actions of communities, CSOs, leaders and authorities. This means that sometimes, even small changes that are locally led and accepted can constitute major programmatic successes. However, the International Alert report highlights several methods for breaking down these broad concepts in order to measure incremental changes such as “more gender-equitable

participation mechanisms, more peaceful/more gender-equitable attitudes or levels of violence, as well as changes in these.”\textsuperscript{123}

The report goes on to explain why measuring and evaluating impacts of peacebuilding programmes that have peacebuilding and gender objectives is important, namely:

- **To understand positive and negative impacts of programming to ensure that interventions “do no harm”**

- **To be accountable to stakeholders, both beneficiaries and donors**

- **To gather data to inform the peacebuilding efforts of numerous actors,\textsuperscript{124}**

Beyond these reasons, evidence gathering on gender inclusive peacebuilding programme can help to generate more funding and support such initiatives by further highlighting the linkages between gender and conflict. Additionally, M&E can enable the practitioners to identify and understand what works and what does not work, improving peacebuilding programming overall.
Advancing a gender agenda in programming requires institutional frameworks that outline organizational approaches and strategies for integrating gender at design and implementation phases as well as in monitoring and evaluation processes. Additionally, frameworks to address gender inequality and to promote inclusivity demonstrate the institution’s commitment and set a tone for adherence to good gender practices within programming. As gender inclusive programming expands, it will also have implications for continuous review and improvement of institutional policies and practices to integrate lessons learned from programming.

Institutional frameworks, including policies and expected practices, provide guidance to staff on how to pursue institutional objectives. As it relates to gender inclusive peacebuilding, these institutional frameworks should lay out:

- The organization’s understanding of what is gender inclusive peacebuilding;
- The organization’s vision for gender inclusive peacebuilding;
- The organization’s guiding principles for gender inclusive peacebuilding;
- The organization’s objectives, strategic plan and performance indicators as they relate to gender;
- Organizational guidance for advancing gender inclusive peacebuilding;
- Organizational communication strategy for promoting gender inclusive peacebuilding;
- Policies and structures, including budget allocations, to ensure organizational capacity for implementing gender inclusive peacebuilding programming.

Adopting a gender inclusive approach to peacebuilding may require a review of existing frameworks for operations to create a conducive environment.
Foundation Ten:
Engage donors and the international community to align priorities for gender equality and inclusivity in peacebuilding to local realities and priorities

Interpeace’s mandate includes assisting the international community in playing a more effective role in supporting peacebuilding processes globally. By capturing good practices, promoting local leadership and connecting that local leadership in gender transformation to international actors supporting peacebuilding processes, Interpeace can ensure that donor priorities and efforts are aligned with those of the communities and societies the initiatives aim to support.

The 2013 ODI Assessment of the evidence of links between gender equality, peacebuilding and statebuilding found that “gender-blind peacebuilding processes remain the norm, despite other improvements at the international level, with provisions such as UNSCR 1325 that articulate a (political and normative) commitment by all relevant actors (states, donors, international organizations) to ensure that all efforts to support peace processes are gender-responsive, and to support the participation of women in all key aspects of this. Progress on this has been limited.”125 Among the challenges for gender-responsive peacebuilding and statebuilding mentioned in the report is that “Donors show a lack of understanding about gender issues across the different sectors. The issues are left to the ‘gender experts’, with the result that gender-responsive approaches often remain peripheral to mainstream donor engagement in peacebuilding and statebuilding efforts.”126

Documenting experiences, best practices and lessons learned, developing evidence-based recommendations, strengthening linkages between actors on the ground and donor circles, and facilitating informed dialogue on gender inclusive programming has a potential to inform donor and international community understanding and funding priorities as well as to increase progress and impact. This has the potential to enhance peacebuilding programming to generate more profound peacebuilding and gender equality impacts.
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Conclusion

Through years of programming experience in post-conflict contexts, Interpeace has learned that inclusion, particularly of marginalized and historically excluded groups, is fundamental for the sustainability of peacebuilding efforts. Gender, as seen through an intersectional lens, is arguably one of the most profound and pervasive sources of exclusion across cultures and contexts globally. Gender inclusive peacebuilding programming can both render peacebuilding efforts more sustainable and create opportunities for the transformation of norms and practices that perpetuate inequality based on gender and other identities.

The present Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding Programming Practice Note provides five key takeaways as to why gender is important for peacebuilding programming:

- **Conflict dynamics are inherently gendered.** Analysing the gendered nature of conflict dynamics not only deepens understanding of conflicts themselves, it also lays a more comprehensive foundation for developing relevant and effective strategies for countering violence and promoting peace.

- **Gender identities and expressions of masculinities and femininities influence how men, women, boys and girls engage in violent conflicts.** Understanding the social pressures that influence men and women’s engagement in direct violence and the relationship between masculinities, femininities and how they manifest in conflict dynamics, is important for developing strategies that aim at transforming how men and women behave and how they relate to each other to promote more peaceful expressions of masculinity and femininity for long-term peacebuilding.

- **Gender influences the types of vulnerabilities that individuals face before, during and after violent conflicts.** In a peacebuilding context, it is important to identify, understand and address these specific vulnerabilities to prevent recurrent cycles of violence, provide alternatives for peace and build societies more resilient to violent conflict.

- **Gender influences the capacities of resilience developed and exercised by individuals and groups in the face of violent conflict.** Understanding the gendered nature of these resilience capacities and how they manifest in conflict and post-conflict settings can enable peacebuilders to harness and build upon these capacities to broaden peace agency and bring diverse actors into peacebuilding processes.

- **Gender norms have an impact how individuals and groups, participate in, influence and shape peace process.** For gender inclusive processes to positively contribute to peacebuilding efforts, they must go beyond representation and include opportunities and strategies for influencing, strategies that specifically challenge and transform power for more equal decision-making. Real inclusion of women, men, boys and girls of different background has been demonstrated to improve the effectiveness of efforts to stop violence and build peace.
Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding Programming comes with several challenges that practitioners must balance to ensure that their programming is effective and does no harm. The Ten Foundations for Gender Inclusive Peacebuilding Programming presented in this document provide a basis for practitioners to purposefully face and navigate these challenges. They provide guidance on what is necessary to leverage gender inclusion for sustainable peacebuilding and peacebuilding programming for the advancement of gender equality, both of which are integral for long-term transformation towards peace. The ten Foundations enable peacebuilding programming to:

- Transform the behaviours of women, men, girls and boys that perpetuate cycles of violence;
- Address sources of exclusion and marginalization that exacerbate vulnerabilities and reinforce conflict dynamics;
- Respond to the needs, interests and priorities of women, men, girls and boys;
- Harnessing resilience capacities of different groups of women, men, girls and boys to have a critical mass of peace agents; and
- Create opportunities for women, men, boys and girls to meaningfully participate in and influence peacebuilding and decision-making.

This practice note provides a basis for future programming and interventions that are progressively more gender inclusive. The application of the Ten Foundations requires institutional commitment, the development, revision and enhancement of tools, practices and processes, and a continuous process of assessment, learning and innovation to ensure that peacebuilding programming is more effective, sustainable and gender inclusive. For Interpeace, this is fundamental for the pursuit of the institution’s change framework and the application of its principles and approaches.
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