

**A Survey of UN 1325 National Action Plan Mechanisms for
Implementation, Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation**

**A Discussion Paper
prepared for the U.S. Civil Society Working Group on Women, Peace and Security**

by

**Sahana Dharmapuri
Fellow, Gender, Peace and Security
Carr Center for Human Rights Policy
Harvard Kennedy School of Government**

November 2011

Introduction

This document is a summary of the key findings from a desk review on participatory mechanisms that have been used by other countries to facilitate dialogue during the development and implementation of their National Action Plans to implement UN 1325 (NAP). A matrix which summarizes the different structures and processes created to monitor, evaluate and facilitate dialogue with civil society in six countries is included. It provides some quick background information about types of models that could potentially be included in the US plan at this stage.

About the U.S. Civil Society Working Group on Women, Peace and Security

The U.S. Civil Society Working Group on Women, Peace and Security comprises organizations and individuals dedicated to advancing the rights, security and participation of women in the prevention of and response to conflict. The Working Group is made up of scholars, peace and development practitioners, and human rights advocates, with years of experience working with women across conflict zones worldwide. Convened by the Gender and Peacebuilding Center at the U.S. Institute of Peace, the Working Group has been regularly meeting since its formation in July 2010.

Summary of Key Findings

UN 1325 National Action Plans are meant to be a roadmap for transforming current National policies that concern defense, diplomacy and development, to be more inclusive and gender-sensitive. Central to any action plan are goals, budgets, plans for monitoring and evaluation of performance and reporting requirements. However, a key finding of this desk review is that the current set of National Action Plans to Implement UN 1325 show a lack of clarity in answering the practical questions of “who is responsible, how is this activity going to be funded, and when will it be completed?” While most plans focus on the “what” (meaning what they would like to do, such as to increase women’s participation, or to provide training to key government officials) the NAPs focus mainly on process not outcomes. Issues of budget, clear lines of responsibility, timelines, and the establishment of coordinating or oversight bodies are considered to be minimum standards for NAPs by Civil Society Groups the world over, yet these details have yet to be adequately reflected in National Action Plans to implement UN 1325 to-date.

Key Findings:

1. It’s an evolving process. Implementation of UN 1325 and the creation of NAPs is a new and still evolving process. Most NAPs have been developed within the last several years and are considered to be “living documents” that will undergo review and adjustment over time with the engagement of multiple stakeholders.¹ There have been many stops and starts. For

¹ UNIFEM presentation, *1325/1820 National Action Plans*, April 24, 2009.

example, the UK NAP was originally developed without civil society engagement in 2006. However, after its release, the government brought in civil society to review and make recommendations on how to improve the UK NAP. A second UK NAP was adopted in 2009 that is more participatory in nature, includes “measurements” of progress, focuses its efforts on bi-lateral engagement, and includes a monitoring and evaluation reporting plan. Similarly, in the case of Nordic countries, civil society has been included in the NAPs at some point, yet it was only the Finnish 1325 network that was including in the writing process. All Nordic NAPs mention the role of civil society in monitoring, however only the Finnish NAP includes representatives from civil society in the formal structures of the monitoring in the NAP as well as in practice.² Implementation strategies that recognize the connection of existing gender policies such as broad political commitments like the Beijing Platform for Action, are the most effective.³

2. Working groups turn into oversight bodies. Most Civil Society Working Groups established to engage in a participatory development of a NAP usually evolve into the main oversight body. These have been established by Executive Order, or appointment by the lead government body. While most countries have not fully developed participatory mechanisms, the UK, Finland, the Netherlands, Nepal, and the Philippines and Liberia, all have outlined such oversight bodies in their NAPs. In addition, recent reports produced by Civil Society actors on implementation mechanisms provide more information on how these participatory mechanisms function. The oversight bodies take various forms, from High-Level steering committees, to formalized Civil Society observatory bodies and task-forces, to Civil Society Working Groups associated with parliamentary bodies/committees. See chart below for details on countries as “good practice” examples.
3. There’s no budget. It is no secret that effective planning and implementation require predictable funding. However, most NAPs do not include budgets for the development of the NAP, its implementation, or for monitoring and evaluation of the NAP. Instead, NAPS usually state that the activities will be “mainstreamed” into existing offices, activities and budgets. Very few of the European NAPS include indicators and benchmarks.⁴ In contrast the Asian and African NAPs are more thorough in outlining benchmarks, indicators and sometimes even budget allocation. Nordic countries do not publicly reveal their budget lines.⁵

² Elin Danielsson, *Ranking the Nordic National Action Plans for the Implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security*, Kvinna till Kvinna (no date).

³ CEDAW reporting is another useful link, however the US has not ratified CEDAW so this may be irrelevant in the US case. See *Costing and Financiing UN 1325*, 2011,, 13.

⁴ *Implementing UN 1325: 21 Case Studies from the EU*, 2010

⁵ *Costing and Financiing UN 1325*, 2011, 81.(See chart. “Most NAPs do not specify the budget dedicated for the development and implementation.”

4. Indicators to implement, monitor and evaluate UN 1325 NAPs exist. The UN Inter-Agency Taskforce on Women, Peace and Security under OSAGI, requested indicators to be established (in UN Security Council Resolution 1889). The UN Technical Working Group on Indicators (UNTWG) was formed to develop a common set of indicators for tracking UN 1325 implementation globally. These were presented by the UN Secretary General to the Security Council in April 2010.⁶ However, there is still some debate about whether or not these UN indicators are the appropriate indicators to use.⁷ Civil Society groups have also developed indicators and have used them in efforts to track implementation of UN 1325. The Global Network of Women Peacebuilders (GNWP) contributed to this effort by developing a set of indicators, working with UN TWGI, UNIFEM, and other agencies. While some of the indicators are similar, the GNWP indicators are from a civil society perspective. The outcomes of the GNWP monitoring in Afghanistan, Burundi, Canada, DRC, Fiji, Nepal, Netherlands, Philippines, Rwanda, and Sierra Leone and Uganda were published in the book “Women Count—Security Council Resolution 1325: Civil Society Monitoring Report, 2010.”⁸ The Global Monitoring Checklist on Women, Peace and Security was developed by Gender Action for Peace and Security UK (GAPS-UK). GAPS-UK conducted a five-country monitoring study on Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal, Northern Ireland, and Sri Lanka, using 11 key UN 1325 indicators.⁹
5. Reporting requirements exist, but the reports don’t. AU member states are required to report annually on their progress in gender mainstreaming, and to provide each other with updates on progress made during the Ordinary Sessions of the Assembly. However, a review by the African Women’s Rights Observatory (AWRO) showed that only a handful of countries have provided reports. Similarly, a review of Nordic NAPs undertaken by the civil society group Kvinna till Kvinna of Nordic country NAPs, showed that “weak monitoring mechanisms constitute a major weakness of more or less all the NAPs. The Norwegian NAP is the most detailed...regarding its monitoring system since it provides information about the dates for evaluations to be submitted...” The report goes on to note, however, that Norway has failed to accomplish this in practice.

⁶ Ambassador Anwarul K. Chowdhury, *Doable Fast-Track Indicators for UN 1325*, July 2010.

⁷ *Costing and Financing UN 1325*, 2011, 11.

⁸ *Costing and Financing UN 1325*, 2011, 12.

⁹ *Global Monitoring Checklist on Women, Peace and Security*, Gender Action for Peace and Security UK: The 11 indicators are: 1) Key Actors in the country, 2) Key National Policy Frameworks, 3) National-level Activities Related to UN 1325, 4) National Government Financial Resources (Art. 7) , 5) Peace Negotiations and Peace Agreements (Art. 8/AP8), 6) Governance and Institution Building (Art 13), 7) Security Sector Reform and Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (Point 11), 8) Transitional Justice and Judicial Reform, 9) Sexual and Gender-based Violence Prevention and Response (Art. 10-12) , 10) International Law (Art. 9), and 11)the UN in country.

Good Practice Examples for UN 1325 National Action Plan Monitoring, Reporting, and Evaluation Mechanisms				
	Country/Date	Coordinating and Monitoring Mechanisms	Indicators (Y/N)	Budget
1	Finland 2008-2011	Finland established a 1325-Steering Committee to promote the implementation of its NAP. The Steering Committee includes representatives of organizations which participated in the preparation of Finland's NAP, including the civil society group 1325-Network. The Finnish NAP does not include clear M&E mechanisms. However, once a year the Advisory Board on Human Rights is to report on the implementation of UN 1325. The 1325 Network is trying to monitor the NAP. One approach has been to call Heads of Ministries directly for information on budgeting. An extensive independent evaluation on how well the implementation of the NAP is carried out in Finland's official foreign aid policies in three countries was published in January 2010.	N	N
2	Liberia 2009	Liberia created a Civil Society Monitoring Observatory group (CSMO) , based on strict selection criteria. This Observatory will monitor the implementation process from the perspectives of civil society and women's groups. The CSMO will prepare a Shadow Report at the end of the four-year implementation period that will parallel the official government report to the UN Security Council and the Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues to the UN Secretary-General 10 (OSAGI). A National Steering Committee exists but needs to be strengthened, and a Technical Monitoring and Evaluation Task Force set up to monitor the implementation of the LNAP. Reporting requirements include yearly reports to the President of Liberia and a Final Report to the President and Cabinet at the end of the 48 month implementation period.	Y	Y
3	Nepal 2011-2016	The NAP outlines both the implementation and the institutional arrangement for implementation of the plan in great detail in chapters 8 & 9. Nepal established a Steering Committee for Implementing the NAP comprised of 25 members from the various government agencies and civil society groups. The Chair of the Steering Committee is the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The NAP also delineates the functions, duties and powers of the Steering Committee, the Implementation Committee, and a District Coordination Committee.	Y	Y
4	Netherlands 2000	Four ministries are involved in implementing the NAP: the MFA, the MoD, the Ministry of Interior, and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sciences. There are focal points in both the MFA and the MoD, but their mandate is unclear. The Dutch government considers all signatories responsible for implementation. CSOs are consulted 3 times a year on implementation. Parliament introduced a motion in 2010 for mission papers to include progress reports. No M& E mechanisms were included in the NAP, but there is a sub-group was formed in 2010 which includes civil society, the	N	Y. See Costing and Financing, p 53-55 for

		MFA and MoD. The M&E group decided not to develop its own indicators, and instead rely on UN and EU indicators. Their work fed into the NAP mid-term review which took place in April 2010.		details.
5	Philippines 2010-2015	The National Steering Committee on Women, Peace and Security (NCWPS) was created by Executive Order (EO) No. 865 and is chaired by the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process (PAPP) and the Chair of the Philippine Commission on Women (PCW). Section 4 of EO 865 stipulates that the Committee shall partner with civil society organizations, particularly with women and peace groups in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the NAP. CSOs that were part of the formulation of the NAP formed their own mechanism in 2010 to implement, monitor and evaluate the NAP. It is the first country to allocate money towards the NAP process from its own governmental funds dedicated to the promotion of gender equality. It used gender budgeting to identify existing resources.	Y	Y. See Costing and Financing, p 42-45 for details.
6	United Kingdom (1 st NAP in 2006) (2 nd NAP in 2010)	The lead departments for the UK NAP are the FCO, the Ministry of Defense, and the Department for International Development which form the UK Cross-Whitehall Group on UNSCR 1325 . The 2010 NAP states that the NAP will be reviewed annually, incorporating feedback from civil society focus groups. Progress will be reported to Parliament and civil society through the Associate Parliamentary Group on Women, Peace and Security (APG-WPS) . A full evaluation plan will be carried out in 3 years. To date, the Associate Parliamentary Group on Women, Peace and Security the parliamentary forum in the UK for discussion and critical analysis of issues relating to UN 1325, has proved the most useful monitoring mechanism and tool for ensuring the government complies with UN 1325 commitments. The Civil Society Group on Gender, Peace & Security (GAPS) provides the secretariat and coordinates the group, which has continued to grow in importance since 2006. The group is considered essential for maintaining productive relationships between the different government ministries, MPs, and the NGO community, as well as encouraging increased awareness in parliamentary debate. The 2010 NAP states one of its lessons learned is that “The NAP cannot be a static document...its needs to reflect developments in national policy, international actions and civil society feedback.”	N	N

Selected Bibliography

In addition to reviewing the publically available National Action Plans on UN 1325 available online at <http://www.peacewomen.org/pages/about-1325/national-action-plans-naps>, the following documents were also included in the review:

Cabrera-Balleza, Mavic, and Nicola Popovic, edited by Dewi Suralaga and Mavic Cabrera-Balleza. *Costing and Financing 1325: Examining the Resources Needed to Implement UN Security Council Resolution 1325 at the National Level as well as the Gains, Gaps and Glitches on Financing the Women, Peace and Security Agenda*. Cordaid and ICAN-GNWP. May 2011.

European Peacebuilding Liasion Office (EPLO). *UNSCR 1325 in Europe: 21 Case Studies of Implementation*. Brussels. June 2010.

European Peacebuilding Liasion Office (EPLO) and International Alert. *Civil Society Recommendation on the Implementation of UN SCR 1325 in Europe*. (no date)

Danielsson, Elin. *Ranking the Nordic National Action Plans for the Implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security*. Kvinna till Kvinna. (no date)

Gender Action for Peace and Security, UK (GAPS-UK). *Global Monitoring Checklist on Women, Peace and Security: Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Nepal, Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka*. (no date)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland. *Implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 “Women, Peace and Security” in the Context of Finnish Development Policy, with Case Studies from Kenya, Nepal and North-East India, Final Report*. January 31. 2010.

NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security. *Issue Brief for Implementing Security Council Resolution 1325*. October 2007.

United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (UN-INSTRAW). *Security Equality, Engendering Peace: A guide to policy and planning on women, peace and security (UN 1325)*. Lead author Kristin Valasek. Editor Hilary Anderson. Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic. 2006.