

What next for the UK's women, peace and security agenda?

Recommendations and Workshop Summary

Fifteen years since UN Security Council Resolution 1325 was enacted, the UN has conducted a [High Level Review](#) of its implementation and the wider progress of women, peace and security commitments. In October 2015, the UN Security Council held an [Open Debate](#) on the review's findings and member states made individual and collective [commitments](#) to support further progress. On **Monday 9 November**, the [LSE Centre for Women, Peace and Security](#), [Women for Women International UK](#) and the [UK Gender Action for Peace and Security network](#) (GAPS) co-hosted a **one day workshop** to debate the UK Government's [commitments](#) made at the Open Debate the previous month.

Supported by the [LSE Institute of Global Affairs](#), the workshop was well attended by representatives from women's rights organisations, academics and researchers, civil servants, international NGOs and students to discuss insights from the existing evidence base and experience to develop cogent recommendations for the UK Government. Two storifieds were also produced after the event by [the LSE Centre for Women, Peace and Security](#) and [Women for Women International UK](#).

1. Recommendations:

1. The UK Government (UKG) must recognise and implement WPS as a **human rights** framework and articulate long-term, sustained and demonstrable commitment to effectively implementing the fundamental human rights standards enshrined in WPS.
2. The UKG must strengthen engagement at the **micro level**: we must listen to local actors and tailor our responses accordingly. Regular and consistent conversations with communities are essential to understand the realities on the ground, develop effective approaches (e.g. security sector reform) and as important feedback mechanisms to support accountability. Working in partnership with local organisations is the most effective way to do this.
3. The UKG should work to provide **comprehensive support** to women affected by conflict: education, legal, social, economic and political. WfWI research showed that savings alone were not enough to support women's economic resilience and needed to be part of a wider economic rights and empowerment approach (numeracy, business skills, vocational training, etc.). Research also highlighted the importance of health education and literacy. Other speakers highlighted the importance of trauma and psychosocial healing and access to justice (rights awareness). This is not only a necessity for improving women's rights but also an effective foundation in order to support their political, economic and social participation.
4. The UKG must provide adequate dedicated **WPS funding**. Local organisations who are on the frontlines are in dire need of core funding and it is these organisations that can effectively support women's economic resilience, women's access to education and justice, and economic empowerment (etc.)
5. The UKG's approach to conflict prevention and post-conflict reconstruction should be a **long-term investment**, which supports community cohesion and addresses gender inequality – including through stepping up working with men and women in communities. Engaging with men and challenging harmful masculinities is an important part of promoting gender equality.
6. The UKG must strengthen its efforts to prevent, protect and respond to **violence against women and girls** (VAWG) in conflict-affected contexts. VAWG is wider than sexual violence and the majority of

sexual violence in conflict-affected countries is not perpetrated by combatants, but family members and other community members. Preparedness planning should ensure that services and supplies (e.g. rape kits) are in place from the outset of crisis response. The UK must prioritise the implementation of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Gender-Based Violence guidelines.

7. Peace agreements are more sustainable when women are involved – the UKG must actively support the meaningful **inclusion of women's groups** and representatives in peace processes where it is active. Inter alia, this is likely to include supporting capacity building of women representatives and women's groups such as communication and negotiation skills, agenda preparation, or offering child care support.
 8. **'Participation'** efforts must focus on meaningful participation and quotas could be used to work towards a critical mass and as an entry point for women's meaningful participation. Women's participation must be prioritised before, during and after peace processes. The UKG must therefore provide capacity building support (as above) to support more women to effective access opportunities to participate as well as supporting other governments (and in the UK) to actively provide more opportunities.
 9. **Security sector reform** efforts by the UKG must be strengthened to be more gender-sensitive.
 10. The UKG should work with women's groups and other civil society organisations (in the UK and abroad) to develop a coherent narrative that articulates the links between women's rights and empowerment, such as the Sustainable Development Goals, the Beijing Platform for Action, WPS and CEDAW.
 11. The UKG should incorporate **CEDAW** into its Women, Peace and Security policy and implementation.
 12. The UKG should use its international influence at the **UN** to :
 - a. Continue to champion WPS and support political will for better WPS implementation.
 - b. Support the increase of numbers of women UN peacekeepers.
 - c. Conduct research and evaluations on the experiences and roles of women UN peacekeepers. UNSG's commitment to double amount of women peacekeepers is welcome but we need to know more about effective support, training and challenges.
 - d. Support the UN to be more transparent around the peacekeeping data it does collect.
 - e. Support the CEDAW committee to engage more with the UNSC on WPS.
 - f. Improve screening processes for UN Peacekeepers.
-

2. Workshop Summary:

Opening remarks were provided by **Professor Christine Chinkin** (Director, LSE Centre for Women, Peace and Security) and **Caroline Green** (Interim Director, GAPS). They reflected upon the unprecedented level of global recognition that the women, peace and security agenda is receiving but that clear and new commitments made at the UNSC Open Debate were lacking. They noted the need to connect the international agenda to local needs and agendas and ongoing, significant gaps in funding for work in the area.

Session 1: Women's roles in conflict prevention

Hannah Wright (Gender, Peace and Security Advisor, Saferworld) chaired the session and opened it by highlighting the priority places on conflict prevention which was well received at the UNSC. She further noted that the UK made specific commitments around conflict prevention at the Open Debate: that it, with early warning, would remain at the heart of the WPS agenda and that *"The UK will ensure that, by September 2016, all our early warning and joint conflict analysis and assessment tools are fully gender-sensitive."* (Baroness Verma, UK Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, at the UN Security Council Open Debate on Women, Peace and Security, 13 October 2015).

Dr Jana Krause (Visiting Research Fellow in the Department of War Studies, King's College London) presented some of her research from Indonesia and Nigeria. She noted the rift between women who fought for peace and women combatants and women who indirectly support the armed conflict through, for example, the provision of meals or shelter, providing intelligence or other aspects important to coordinating attacks. Dr Krause highlighted that her research had found that women identify and mobilise based on diverse social identities, not just 'women' or 'mothers'. With regard to policy efforts to engage women in the prevention of terrorism, she discussed the underlying assumption that women hold significant influence over men and boys in families and communities and would thus be in a position to counter radicalisation. However, women's positions within communities and their influence over men can vary dramatically, and they themselves may support radicalisation.

Lana Khattab (Programme Officer for Gender in Peacebuilding, International Alert) presented some key insights based on International Alert's (IA) work on gender and conflict prevention, with specific examples from DRC and Lebanon. IA adopts a 'gender-relational approach' which means working more broadly (i.e. including men, women, and LGBTI) and more deeply (i.e. across different social markers) to understand what 'gender' means in any given context. In Lebanon, IA conducted a [2-year research project in Lebanon](#) to analyse the root causes of the conflict between citizens and the Lebanese security sector. The report was published in November 2014 and found key differences between men's and women's responses to security institutions (police) with 75% of women and men reported that they would go to the police but, in reality, 47% of women reported going to the police in practice, compared to only 38% of men who were more likely to go to political parties and women more likely to go to family. Rigid gender norms promote inequalities between women and men and institutionalised masculine cultures in the police force effective response to domestic violence and sexual and gender based violence. IA has been working in **DRC** since 2000 and published research on women's political participation and economic empowerment, which shows that more active economic roles for women does not automatically produce an improvement in their social status and political participation. However, it is true that poor political participation by women reinforces their economic vulnerability. Ms Khattab highlighted lessons from two recent projects in DRC which led to a combined approach and the initiation of the *Tushiriki Wote* project. The key problem this project seeks to address is women's economic vulnerability and their exclusion from decision-making in DRC at all levels. The rationale behind working on women's political participation and economic empowerment draws on our understanding of sustainable, positive peace.

Marwa Baabbad (Yemeni women's rights activist) highlighted the high level of conflict in Yemen and the deterioration since September 2014 when militia groups entered the capital. In March 2015, a Saudi-led Arab Coalition intervened and bombed Sana'a. Yemen has a long history of civil wars and recent conflict within the context of the so-called 'Arab Spring'. Following the Arab Spring a National Dialogue Conference was held in Yemen. International donors were committing large sums of money but donors had no red lines and the militia gained legitimacy (did not address underlying causes). International community turned a blind eye to abuses by authorities. The conflict has impacted on gender dynamics and most Yemeni women, even when highly educated and with qualifications, are housewives. Women's role in the conflict has changed as they are now perpetrators as well as victims. Ms Baabbad highlighted that empowerment has to be locally relevant and defined and support from UN to prepare Yemeni women leaders is welcome but risks conflicting with perceptions of traditional values. Recommended that donors focus on micro-level programming in conflict zones and women and men to engage in community-level fora. Working with men is crucial to address harmful notions of masculinities. Also need to support larger NGOs who work in partnership with smaller, more micro-level NGOs. When working with people in conflict countries, we need to remain human and try to understand the situation.

Session 1's Discussion included restrictions on women in security forces to administrative roles and informal paths and roles that women play which are not recorded – who creates culture and who defines it? We also discussed the focus in WPS on peace and women's rights organisations and not so much on women as combatants. A delegate noted that peace processes include armed groups and that guns are qualify groups for seats at the peace table – would women be taken more seriously in peace if they were armed? The utilitarian aspect of WPS was acknowledged whereby WPS as a human rights framework is not enough for some actors who are more convinces by the benefits from women's participation and prevention of VAW. A possible tension was flagged between women's roles in conflict prevention (short-term) and more long-term approaches towards gender-equality. Local, real-time connections were highlighted and that smaller pots of funding more accessible to support their response to conflict, violence or insecurity. Noted that small projects are often unable to access funding – affected by the UK's austerity with less capacity to manage grants and a leaning towards bigger grants which are inaccessible for smaller organisations. The role of the private sector was also flagged both in terms of the UK's wider conflict and security approach as well as within WPS.

Session 2: Women's roles in building peace

The **Baroness Hodgson of Abinger CBE** (APPG on Women, Peace and Security) chaired the session and highlighted evidence) of the greater likelihood of peace when women are involved in peace negotiations and peacekeeping, as acknowledged by the new UNSCR. Research published by the Graduate Institute of Geneva earlier this year demonstrated that, in a survey of 40 peace process, women's ability to influence negotiations increased the chances of agreements being reached. Yet women's participation remains low with only 4% of signatories to peace agreements (1992 – 2011) being women. This appears to be a continuing trend with only one woman present at the recent Syrian peace talks in Vienna.

The organisers had planned for **Hasina Safi** (Director of the Afghan Women's Network) to speak at the workshop via video-link but technical issues prevented this. A GAPS film on Afghanistan, featuring Afghan women's rights defenders, was shown: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6mWpKh9M-4E>

Shaheen Chughtai (Deputy Head of Humanitarian Policy and Campaigns, Oxfam UK) provided some feedback on the Global Study and the Open Debate at UNSC in October. He highlighted the positive signal sent by the review in terms of political engagement as the Review broke two world records: the number of member states who wanted to speak (113) and the number of co-sponsors of UNSCR 2242 (71). Spain, represented by its head of state, and the attention afforded by the UN Secretary General were also positive. However, the change of the Open Debate at short-notice (to accommodate the UNSG and the Spanish premier's diaries) caused significant issues for women's groups, civil society organisations (CSOs) and other activists who had intended to attend. Mr Chughtai highlighted that UNSCR 2242 in itself is broadly positive but a mixed bag addressing numerous well known issues while the small number of tangible commitments made by member states was a disappointment. The apparent high level of political interest, however, is an opportunity for CSOs and activists to build on that interest and help convert it into action. Holistic approaches are important: ones that bring together threads on economic empowerment and access to justice. Women's participation is still often seen as unnecessary, a luxury or an add-on. For example in Afghanistan, President Ghani has said that women should be part of the Afghan peace process but only "at the right time" and no women were present at the talks in Pakistan. Women's participation in peace processes should be from the outset of talks. We should also be highlighting that the lack of women's participation, their inclusion, simply is not working. Some examples of good practice exist and Mr Chughtai noted Brazil's decision to develop a National Action Plan and Argentina's intention to increase its female military personnel to 33%.

Dr Marsha Henry (Deputy Director of the LSE Centre for Women, Peace and Security) highlighted the UN commitment to double the amount of women peacekeepers and has the potential to challenge discriminatory norms and support more effective response for women affected by sexual violence in conflict. Despite deployment of all-female squads, the number of females in peacekeeping occupations remain well below 50%. Research on where women peacekeepers have been deployed, the roles and sectors and wider experiences is also missing. Senior positions do not carry significant discretionary power and so women in these positions tend not to have less influence. Women peacekeepers are reluctant to be whistle blowers within a wider context or reluctance, including around sexual exploitation. Numbers of women in peacekeeping forces also comes back to member states and where they come from – few train large numbers of women into forces, with variety of quality of training, and contribute to peacekeeping e.g. India contributes 10,000 women troops Canada only 50. UN really does not provide evidence, knowledge, and numbers of what is actually happening and work on vetting/recruitment issues. Ensuring all peacekeepers (men and women) are trained in women's rights and gender issues is important. Further noted significant difficulties for WPS implementation when peacekeepers do not have an understanding of women's issues - peacekeepers were forbidden to interact with women in Liberia. Dr Henry made the following recommendations: research into peacekeeping effectiveness and experiences of women peacekeepers (increase funding); improved screening; work with men at local levels and challenge gender roles; help create a narrative on what goes on in these countries.

Session 2's Discussion noted that individuals accused on sexual abuse were found to be deployed to other conflict contexts (and at the Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict in 2014) without proper screening/vetting or accountability. It also emphasised the difference in scrutiny placed on militaries in the global south compared to more 'developed' countries. The need for a narrative was emphasised to situate WPS within peace and broader conflict approaches. Would also support the security-development nexus (Sustainable Development Goals) and address power dynamics. The role of education was also discussed as important at both grassroots and high political levels, but also acknowledged it was not a panacea. It was agreed that ring-fenced funding for WPS was important, including for supporting more research.

Session 3: Violence against women in and out of conflict

This session was chaired by **Brita Fernandez Schmidt** (Executive Director, Women for Women International UK) who highlighted that violence against women (VAW) is the biggest block to women's participation at all levels and across sectors. She further highlighted that conflict places women further at risk of VAW but that it is not the root cause – VAW is a form and driver of gender-based discrimination.

Mazeda Hossain (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine) highlighted key findings from her and other's research on the prevention VAW in conflict. She noted that the perpetrators of rape are not only combatants, but also husbands, boyfriends, friends, community and family members: rates of sexual violence are much higher by intimate partners than non-partners. It is estimated that 1 in 5 women fleeing humanitarian crisis settings report being raped in their lifetime. Sexual violence against women & girls continues in all stages of a conflict & varies between settings and is one of many forms of traumatic exposures in conflict settings. Extensive prevention programming but evidence on effectiveness is limited from conflict settings and what does exist often carries methodological limitations. Much of the data comes from different sources (such as human rights documentation, population-level surveys) which tell us different things and also have particular limitations. Ms Hossain highlighted particular challenges in the WPS agenda including: gaps re: effectiveness of prevention approaches in the security sector; and need to continue innovation as VAW prevention in conflict is a relatively new area. Existing data from effective preventions suggests that the following components are important: placing women and girls at the centre of discussions; engaging men and

women; informed by existing theory and evidence; supported by effective response; safety-first; sexual violence as a whole (not just combatant); investing in long-term vision for change.

Mairi MacRae (Director of international research consortium *What Works to Prevent VAWG in Conflict and Humanitarian Crises*, led by the International Rescue Committee) focused her presentation on VAW within the UK's humanitarian efforts and argued that it is not a priority and minimum standards are not even happening in many situations. In Iraq, it took a year for OCHA situation reports to include any information on GBV. Ms MacRae argued that, whenever a crisis hits, wash, health, food items are all prioritised but simple VAWG response such as post-rape kits or safe spaces are not considered as part of the response. When they are provided, they are often poorly distributed. This is true across the board – not isolated examples – and this is underpinned by lack of funding, which has a knock on effect on services and programming. Of the GBV funding that was requested as part of the 2014 Humanitarian Response Plans, very small amounts were actually provided: 5.2% for the Central African Republic, 20.9% for South Sudan, and 5.5% for Iraq. Within the total humanitarian response programming, these funds were miniscule. Coordination is also an issue and the humanitarian community can and should be much better at being accountable for VAWG response. She highlighted that it is vital to keep women and girls at centre of the discussion and, even at the most basic level, recommended including VAWG from the outset of humanitarian response to conflicts. More research is needed in this area to get a better idea of what works (and this is possible), but this should not prevent response. She highlighted the different studies under the DFID funded *What Works* programme of research which aim to address some of the key gaps in evidence on VAWG in conflict and humanitarian contexts. More information about the research can be found: <http://www.whatworks.co.za/about/what-works-components/what-works-vawg-in-conflict> .

Rita Lopidia (EVE, South Sudan) was part of the delegates representing women at the recently concluded South Sudan IGAD-led peace process. South Sudan gained independence in 2011 and conflict broke out in December 2013 which has caused the deaths of tens of thousands of people and displaces an estimated 1.6million people. Sexual and other forms of violence have targeted women and been a feature of this conflict. Peace deal was signed 17 August 2015 and now in a 30-month transitional period. In this deal: women representation shall be 25% in the Transitional Government of National Unity; 7 of 30 ministerial positions will be given to women; 2 of 8 deputy ministers will be women; and women will also make up 25% of the Transitional National legislative Assembly (400 MPs). In addition, there will be a review Political Party Act 2012 no later than six months after the transitional period and the NEC to conduct elections 60 days before the end of the transitional period. The rights of refugees and IDPs to return in safety and dignity and be afforded physical, legal and psychological protection. The NGO Bill 2013 (essentially copied from Sudan) will also be reviewed to conform to international standards. The agreement also contains a Women Enterprise Development Fund, intended to provide subsidised credit for women-based enterprise development and capacity building of women entrepreneurs. It also stipulates that a commission of Truth, reconciliation and healing must be established within six months of the transitional period. This will have 7 commissioners: 4 south Sudanese (2 women) and 3 from other African countries (1 woman). The Hybrid Court of South Sudan (cf. AU report) was established by the AU and it will decide where it sits and will look at Gender based crimes and sexual violence. The provisions in the peace deal have a lot of potential but we need: dissemination to the grass roots (awareness raising); building of women's capacity to take advantage of quotas; specific inclusion of VAW in Court's mandate; proper documentation and survivor-centred support to help the work of the Commission and Court. Also needs to be backed by long-term efforts to make NAP localised, work with men, support young women to enter politics, and international support.

Session 3's Discussion identified the emerging theme of the day of working with men and working at a more localised level, particularly with women in building their capacity and responding to their needs. Disconnections between peace deals and grassroots were flagged as were the needs to address the normalisation of violence – many conflict-affected contexts have gone through prolonged periods of violence

and insecurity, where the abnormal has become normal. Such contexts are complex and require community-level efforts.

Session 4: Comprehensive approaches to WPS.

This session was chaired by **Professor Mary Kaldor** (LSE Civil Society and Human Security Research Unit).

Professor Christine Chinkin (Director of the LSE Centre for Women, Peace and Security) brought together threads from the day and emphasised the need for a human rights approach. She highlighted that a comprehensive approach requires links between pillars to be made and a temporal perspective which takes into account pre-conflict, conflict and post-conflict. Discussions on participation again should think about before, during and after conflict. It is not just a case of getting women into peace talks. Women's own agendas must be taken into account by all sectors and this must be an inclusive approach – not a homogenous group. Our approach should be substantive, multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral, covering areas such as health and governance. Professor Chinkin highlighted the de-prioritisation of human rights as a UK foreign policy priority which was at odds with the Global Study and the UK Government's prioritisation of WPS. She further noted that we need to link work on WPS with CEDAW, the Istanbul Convention and to use human rights enforcement mechanisms. Peace agreements frequently refer to human rights, but this rarely extends to Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCRs). A genuinely comprehensive approach would extend to ESCRs. This is pertinent to the pillars of UNSCR, for example, transitional justice is limited in its recognition of violations of ESCRs. Survivors of violence are less able to participate in transitional justice without access to ESCRs. International law is at the heart of WPS – human rights, international criminal law, refugee law, IDP law and humanitarian law. But she noted that these areas are compartmentalised and fragmented, as WPS is also from other areas of the UN's work. Professor Chinking further noted that these other areas, including emerging areas such as countering violent extremism, must be on WPS terms.

Carron Mann (Policy Manager, Women for Women International UK) presenting the findings from WfWI's [recent research](#) into social cohesion and economic resilience in Afghanistan and Kosovo. The research was conducted with graduates of WfWI's women's empowerment programme since 2009 in both countries through surveys, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. These tools were also used to gather data from women in communities where WfWI had not worked as well as (only in Afghanistan) participants in men's engagement programme. WfWI sees its women's empowerment programme as comprehensive or holistic as it focuses on women's social and economic empowerment through a year-long training programme, works with men in communities where possible and works with partners to provide women participants with referral services. A comprehensive approach, Ms Mann noted, does not mean doing everything yourself and working with partners is key. She highlighted 3 points from the findings that provided insights for thinking about a comprehensive approach: a comprehensive approach to women's education (includes human rights, health, numeracy, literacy and practical and business skills); a comprehensive approach must work to support women's empowerment to increase their **spheres of influence** at the personal, household, community levels and beyond; a comprehensive approach to effectively challenging discrimination means **working with women and men in communities** where discriminatory norms exist. Ms Mann noted that a comprehensive approach in theory, may mean working across the four WPS pillars. In practice, a comprehensive approach must work for all women, even the most marginalised. And must support them as whole human beings, support expanding spheres of influence from the personal to the household to the community and beyond and must also work to challenge discriminatory norms held by communities with all members of the communities. How you do that, she concluded, requires working with women as individuals, working with local partners, community members with influence and building the influence of existing progressive women's rights activists.

Mandira Sharma (Advocacy Forum, Nepal) began her presentation with highlighted the reality of a comprehensive approach based on experiences in Nepal which had seen a trade off in terms of women's access to accountability and justice. The Advocacy Forum has documented hundreds of cases of sexual violence but thus far there has not been one single conviction. She highlighted the case of Maina Sunuwar, a

15 year old girl who was abducted by the military when they were unable to find her mother. It took the military three years to admit that they had taken Maina and they initially claimed that she had been shot trying to escape. Further pressure and investigation by the Advocacy Forum documented that she had been tortured to death by the military and buried in barracks where UN peacekeepers were trained. Arrest warrants were issued but no arrests have been made. Ms Sharma highlighted that transitional justice mechanisms have been very problematic in Nepal and that truth and reconciliation commissions have been affected by a number of controversies. She further highlighted that the statutory limitation on bringing complaints of sexual violence is 35 days. Advocacy Forum has challenged this but this law has not been changed, even after the adoption of Nepal's National Action Plan on WPS. The Nepalese Government denies that there are any cases of sexual violence. Survivors of sexual violence are not considered as victims of conflict and do not receive any benefits. Ms Sharma did note that there had been some successes for women in the transition but was highlighting that access to security and justice was a crucial gap.

Session 4's Discussion clarified some of the terms in the WfWI context and the case raised by Ms Sharma as well as the successes in Nepal. These included consultations with women's groups as part of the NAP at both the national and district level, although these did not actively include survivors of sexual violence. The Nepalese Government maintains that there were no cases of sexual violence as part of the conflict so there is no need to have a policy or recognition for survivors. There were also two commissions (truth and into enforced disappearances). The panel concluded that the WPS framework was an achievement of activism by local and international women's rights activists and commitment is relatively isolated at high political levels (such as the UNSC) with few activists being able to use it for local advocacy. The challenge is to reclaim it as human rights framework for activism and not just a policy framework.

3. About the Organisers:

The **LSE Centre for Women, Peace and Security** is a leading academic space for scholars, practitioners, activists, policy-makers and students to develop strategies to promote justice, human rights and participation for women in conflict-affected situations around the world. Through innovative research, teaching, and multi-sectoral engagement, the Centre aims to promote gender equality and enhance women's economic, social and political participation and security. www.lse.ac.uk/wps; women.peace.security@lse.ac.uk

Since 1993, **Women for Women International** has supported more than 420,000 marginalised women in eight countries affected by war and conflict. We offer women support, tools, and access to life-changing skills to move from crisis and poverty to stability and economic self-sufficiency. We bring women together in a safe space to learn life, business, and vocational skills through our combined social and economic year-long programme. We also deliver a men's engagement programme that trains male leaders and male community members in gender equality and women's rights. www.womenforwomen.org.uk; SupportUK@womenforwomen.org

Gender Action for Peace and Security (GAPS) is the UK's only Women, Peace and Security civil society network. We are a membership organisation of [17 NGOs](#) and experts in the field of development, human rights, humanitarian and peacebuilding. We were founded to progress the [United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325](#) on Women, Peace and Security. Our role is to promote and hold the UK government to account on its international commitments to women in conflict areas worldwide. <http://gaps-uk.org/>; info@gaps-uk.org

November 2015