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INTRODUCTION

NATO, Allies and Partners have made tangible progress to advance the Women, Peace, and Security (WPS) agenda, as developed in UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (UNSCR 1325). At the same time, the gains that have been made are fragile, and much more remains to be done.

The 2014 NATO/EAPC Policy for the Implementation of UNSCR 1325 on Women Peace and Security and Related Resolutions explains the importance of this effort: “Our work on Women, Peace and Security is fundamental to the realization of our common values of individual liberty, democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and our obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and other sources of international law. These common values and legal obligations cannot be fulfilled if women cannot participate fully and freely, or if their rights are not respected.”


The 2014 Action Plan recognized that the WPS agenda is relevant not only for NATO operations in Afghanistan and Kosovo, but for all activities undertaken by NATO, Allies and Partners. It expanded NATO’s WPS agenda from military operations to include the full range of NATO’s political and civilian activities. It is a plan for mainstreaming the WPS agenda in the work of the organization—that is, integrating gender concerns and making the WPS agenda an integral part of NATO’s everyday business in both civilian and military activities. Mainstreaming the WPS agenda will advance NATO’s core tasks: collective defence, crisis management and cooperative security.

This report is an independent, unclassified assessment of NATO’s WPS efforts since 2014, as called for in action point 14.7 of the 2014 Action Plan. It focuses on actions where the NATO International Staff and NATO Military Authorities are the implementing entities. It does not assess actions that have been undertaken by National Authorities. This assessment is based on reviews of publicly available unclassified documents and off-the-record, unclassified interviews with more than 55 people at NATO Headquarters (HQ), Allied Command Operations (ACO) and Allied Command Transformation (ACT).
MAIN FINDINGS

NATO’s WPS Report Card is mixed. NATO has made tangible progress on the WPS agenda, but much more remains to be done.

The 2014 Action Plan aimed to institutionalize and mainstream gender at the political level at NATO HQ in a more systematic manner. In addition, the 2014 Action Plan reinforced and enhanced efforts that were already under way to mainstream gender in NATO’s military operations. The latter efforts were launched in 2007 with the first NATO/EAPC Policy on Implementing UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security.4

Although NATO has made progress on its WPS agenda, the gains that have been made are ad hoc, fragile, and limited. The progress that has been made has been brought about by a small group of highly motivated individuals. There has not been an organization-wide effort to advance and lock-in the WPS agenda. Backsliding in the future is a real possibility, particularly at a time when NATO, Allies and Partners face new security challenges and unpredictable threats. Other issues will inevitably take precedence. In addition, people and organizations tend to revert to their default settings in times of heightened uncertainty.

But, as NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg noted in his 2015 Annual Report, the challenges NATO faces require adaptation. In times of “hybrid threats—where a wide range of overt and covert military, paramilitary, and civilian measures are used to disrupt, confuse, damage or coerce,” the introduction of a gender perspective will generate new needed policy options. As the Secretary General stated, “Gender equality is not optional: it is fundamental. It allows us to respond better and smarter to the complex security challenges we are facing today.”5

THE GLASS HALF FULL

Since 2014, NATO has made progress in advancing the WPS agenda both on the political and the military side. On the political side, the 2014 Action Plan marked the beginning of a more systematic and institutionalized effort to mainstream the WPS agenda.6 On the military side, efforts to integrate the WPS agenda have a longer history and date to NATO/EAPC’s first policy on WPS in 2007.7

NATO has taken several positive steps since 2014:

The SRSG WPS: The institutionalization of the post of the SRSG WPS was a critical step. The SRSG WPS provides intellectual, strategic and organizational leadership for the WPS effort within NATO. The SRSG WPS has also been key in raising the visibility of NATO’s efforts, internally and especially externally. The 15th anniversary of UNSCR 1325 in 2015 provided numerous opportunities for external outreach efforts. NATO now has a substantial network of alliances with partners, international organizations and civil society actors focused on the WPS agenda.
Partner Agreements: NATO has expanded references to gender perspectives and priorities in its partner agreements. As of early 2016, 45% of NATO’s partner agreements included a gender goal. Education and training on gender perspectives and UNSCR 1325 are often identified as partner goals. Some partner agreements have also referred to the development of a WPS National Action Plan or WPS actions to increase the number of women in security institutions.

In addition, the recognition of “gender” in NATO’s Defense Capacity Building (DCB) initiative is an important step that recognizes gender as an alliance capability. Further institutionalization of this effort would lead to more trained personnel and better doctrine in this area. As of early 2016, three out of the four DCB packages had references to a gender component.

As of 2015, 6% (3 out of 48) of the Science for Peace and Security (SPS) programmes, which engage Allies and Partners on research and knowledge exchange projects, had a WPS focus.

Cooperation with International Organizations: NATO’s cooperation with international organizations—the United Nations, the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the African Union, and the International Committee of the Red Cross, in particular—is off to a good start. Relations between NATO and the UN on the WPS agenda are especially promising. Since 2013, the SRSG WPS has addressed the UN Security Council at its annual open debate on WPS. Staff-to-staff talks between NATO and the UN have advanced. This is significant because NATO and the UN will often be deployed in the same areas of operations. NATO and the UN are considering several initiatives to enhance inter-organizational cooperation on the WPS agenda. These initiatives include efforts related to Conflict-Related Sexual and Gender-Based Violence, the Protection of Civilians, and Children in Armed Conflict. NATO (ACO and ACT) has developed plans to convene the Gender Advisors (GENAD) and Gender Focal Points (GFP) of NATO and other international organizations (particularly the UN) to exchange lessons learned and best practices. This may lead to a first meeting in 2016. NATO’s discussions with the EU are promising, particularly now that the EU has appointed its own principal advisor on gender and UNSCR 1325 implementation.

Outreach to Civil Society: NATO’s relations with civil society have also been strengthened. The 2014 Action Plan recognized the important role civil society plays in terms of the WPS agenda. NATO engages civil society actors—including women’s organizations—in the vast majority of its operations. NATO’s engagement with civil society organization is often essential to the success of these operations. The office of the SRSG WPS has laid the groundwork for the convening of the first meeting of the NATO civil society advisory panel in 2016. It has drafted Terms of Reference for the panel, recognizing the importance of civil society engagement in the WPS area.

Gender Perspectives in Military Operations: At the military level, NATO has continued to make good progress in integrating a gender perspective in military operations. The positions of Gender Advisors and Gender Focal Points have been created and formalized. The bi-annual ACO meetings of the military GENADs have led to the creation of a gender community within ACO and ACT. The development of an implementation plan by the Strategic Commands, following the 2013 Review of the Practical Implications of UNSCR 1325 for the Conduct of NATO-led Operations and Missions has been a valuable tool in measuring progress not only of the implementation of Bi-Strategic Command Directive 401-1, but also of the 2014 Action Plan. In July 2015, the ACO
published a very useful *Gender Functional Planning Guide*, which provides practical guidance to GENADs, GFPs and NATO staff with respect to gender perspectives in planning processes. The IMS took the lead in drafting the *Military Guidelines on Conflict Related Sexual and Gender-Based Violence*, which were approved by the Military Committee (MC) in June 2015.

**Training:** ACT, with the help of the Nordic Center for Gender in Military Operations, has developed training modules on WPS, including a training package for nations. Since 2014, ACT has also held an annual discipline conference that reviews WPS education and training gaps and requirements. ACT and ACO have also started to integrate elements of the WPS agenda in crisis management and collective defense exercises. In 2015, five out of the approximately 66 crisis management and collective defence exercises included WPS elements.

**National Data Collection:** The NATO Committee on Gender Perspectives (NCGP) introduced a new National Report survey with an increased number of gender-specific questions. This strengthens data collection efforts and supports the analysis of gender mainstreaming efforts within the armed forces of NATO Allies and Partners. Similarly, the revised Defence Planning Capability Survey will provide more data on gender perspectives and priorities within national defence institutions.

**The Glass Half Empty**

Although NATO has taken positive actions to advance the WPS agenda, substantial progress is still needed in multiple, critical areas.

**Insufficient Understanding of the WPS Agenda:** Awareness of UNSCR 1325 and the WPS agenda has grown in NATO, but understanding of what this agenda means for people in their daily work remains sketchy. Too often, the WPS agenda is seen as an agenda about “women” and an agenda that is only about “protection.”

Applying a gender perspective to substantive areas is not difficult, but it does require asking a different set of questions. It requires people to think about the differential impacts a policy or action might have on women, men, girls and boys and how to mitigate these impacts if they intensify gender inequalities. It requires analysts to not only watch the movement of military hardware, but also the position of women in potential areas of operations. For example, what happens to women is often an early-warning indicator of social and political instability that could lead to armed conflict. Engagement with women and women’s organizations may provide new avenues for diffusion of tensions and de-escalation of violence.

Incorporating a gender perspective and a gender lens to policy problems involves a change of mindsets. It also requires training.

**Partial Progress on Gender Mainstreaming:** Although the introduction of gender perspectives is increasingly part of the planning and execution of NATO military operations, at the policy level, gender perspectives are too often an after-thought, if they are thought about at all.
Many Allied Joint Publications are devoid of gender perspectives. Similarly, gender perspectives are not integrated into strategic forecasting documents.

Only two of the six priority areas highlighted in the 2014 Action Plan have incorporated a gender perspective—the programmes on Small Arms and Light Weapons and Mine Action (SALW and MA) and Building Integrity (BI).\textsuperscript{17} NATO has made little or no progress in mainstreaming gender in the four other areas: Human Trafficking; Protection of Civilians; Children and Armed Conflict; and Counter Terrorism.

In addition, NATO Allies and Partners (and some staff) have had a tendency to think that they can mainstream the WPS agenda in certain areas (notably the Protection of Civilians and Children and Armed Conflict) by subsuming them under the WPS umbrella. While these areas are obviously related, they have different objectives and requirements. Indeed, requirements in these areas are focused on protection and monitoring. They do not have WPS participation and gender equality requirements. For example, in the 2015 Trident Juncture exercise, no staffing requirement was made for a Child Protection Advisor and it fell to the GENAD to deal with the children’s issues raised in the exercise, even though the GENAD had no expertise on these issues.

In sum, the WPS agenda has not yet been mainstreamed in NATO’s day-to-day activities or in its planning for the future.

**The Gap between Statements and Practice:** NATO’s WPS Task Force should play a leading role in setting priorities, shaping the agenda and strengthening coherence and coordination of NATO efforts in the WPS area. Making sure that policies, actions and activities are coordinated and internally consistent is particularly important in a complex, often siloed, organization like NATO. Unfortunately, the Task Force has not played this role.

Three problems stand out. First, NATO’s military and civilian divisions have tended to dispatch junior and temporary staff, even interns, to attend the meetings of the Task Force. Second, the Task Force meets bi-weekly—every other week—which is too frequent. This makes regular, high-level participation more difficult. Third, Task Force meetings devote too much time to calendars and scheduling future meetings, as opposed to substantive policy issues.

The Divisions’ dispatch of junior people to the Task Force is a reflection of a broader problem: the Divisions have not made gender mainstreaming a priority. There is a disconnect between the high priority that the Secretary General has enunciated with respect to gender mainstreaming and the low level of participation by the Divisions in the WPS Task Force.

For many NATO Divisions and staff, the WPS agenda is a secondary or tertiary consideration: it is an add-on that is important only to third parties. (This is also true of many National Action Plans on WPS.) As a result, NATO managers do not have strong incentives to make staff available for WPS-related activities. In addition, most NATO staff members do not receive professional recognition or rewards for doing WPS work.
Gender Imbalances on the NATO Staff: Gender equality is at the heart of the WPS agenda, but NATO has glaring gender imbalances on both the military and civilian sides.\(^1\) As of early 2016, the International Staff (IS), had 0% women at the Deputy Secretary General or Assistant Secretary General levels. There were 0% women in NATO’s HQ highest grades (U1-U4). In 2015, out of the 35 Senior IS civilian staff posts (A-6 and above), only 6 (17%) were occupied by women (2 have an A7 grade; 4 have an A6 grade).\(^\text{19}\)

As the SRSG WPS stated in the introduction to the 2015 Diversity Report: “We can only credibly safeguard and promote the fundamental values and principles on which the Alliance is built if we lead by example and live up to those principles, including the principles of equal rights and opportunities.”\(^\text{20}\)

Inadequate Reporting and Assessment: The primary responsibility for implementing the 2014 Action Plan lies not with the SRSG WPS, but with the Divisions in the IS and the IMS, the Military Authorities (most notably the Strategic Commands), and Allies and Partners. The 2014 Action Plan provides some guidance on implementation and reporting, but the actions it identified were often vague and not prioritized. In addition, the 2014 Action Plan provides no guidance on how to measure progress. Except for the Strategic Commands, none of the Divisions has taken steps to remedy this problem by developing Division-specific action plans which include reporting templates and assessment indicators.\(^\text{21}\) As a result, annual and bi-annual progress reports from the NATO Secretary General and the SRSG WPS note various activities, but these activities are not contextualized and therefore difficult to assess.

Lacking Resources: Although the WPS agenda has received high-level political and military endorsements from NATO officials, Allies and Partners, these declarations have not been supported by a substantial allocation of resources to the WPS area. Resources for the WPS agenda are inadequate, both in terms of staffing and financial resources.

As of early 2016, the SRSG WPS had no administrative assistant, one regular NATO staff person assigned on a temporary basis, one intern (on a 6 month appointment) and three staff members who were National Voluntary Contributions (assigned for two-year periods). The GENADs at the Strategic Commands have had similar staff shortages.

As of early 2016, the WPS Trust Fund (which provides the funds for WPS activities and programs) was only € 400,000. This is a very small pool of funds to support a wide-range of multi-year activities. In addition, only three out of the 55 nations that publicly endorsed the Action Plan have contributed to the Fund.\(^\text{22}\) By way of comparison, NATO’s Building Integrity programme (launched at the same time as the WPS agenda) had a Trust Fund of € 2.6 million—six and half times the funds available to WPS.\(^\text{23}\) The BI Trust Fund is supported by six lead nations; two additional nations pledged funds in early 2016.\(^\text{24}\) NATO’s WPS rhetoric and resources are not in alignment.
RECOMMENDATIONS

This assessment is the foundation for the following recommendations:

**Organizational Commitment and Staff Training:** NATO’s leadership has made a stated, public commitment to the WPS agenda, but it must sustain, strengthen and extend this commitment. NATO’s leadership at the highest levels must make the WPS agenda one of NATO’s explicit, highest priorities, and it must reiterate this commitment regularly. This is the only way the WPS agenda can become an enduring NATO value and organizational practice.

NATO’s commitment to the WPS agenda must be extended throughout the organization from top to bottom and side to side. NATO’s commitment to WPS needs to be broadened and deepened throughout the organization. This will help to embed gender perspectives and gender priorities in everyday thinking, policies, processes and operations. This is what gender mainstreaming is all about.

There is vague awareness about the WPS agenda within NATO, but in-depth knowledge is lacking throughout much of the organization. To make the transition from vague awareness to real understanding, NATO should develop educational and training programs at all levels—again, from top to bottom and side to side. Training for NATO leadership, NATO staff, and staff of national delegations should be adapted to each level. Training could include a combination of in-person and on-line modules. These efforts should also cover sexual harassment training.

**Gender Mainstreaming:** The office of the SRSG WPS should make sure that every NATO Division is involved in the mainstreaming of gender perspectives. To assist the Divisions with this task, NATO HQ should formalize Gender Focal Point (GFP) positions within the Divisions. GFP responsibilities should be written into these job descriptions.

At NATO HQ, many Divisions are involved in the development of policy documents that guide decisions on security issues. Uncovering the gender dynamics of these security issues is an important first step in a gender mainstreaming strategy. Staff must question assumptions about processes that may be implicit in the way a problem or policy has been dealt with in the past. Gender perspectives must be added to and integrated into the equation.

NATO has very impressive intellectual capital. The units at NATO HQ and in the Strategic Commands responsible for strategic analysis and forecasting should be mobilized to examine the gender dynamics of the security challenges facing the Alliance now and in the years ahead. This research would help advance gender mainstreaming within the organization.

In addition to continuing work on the priority areas identified in 2014, NATO should expand this list to include issue areas such as: maritime operations, resilience, and gender as a defence capability. These are high priority and high impact areas where NATO can visibly demonstrate its commitment to the WPS agenda.
The WPS Task Force: The SRSG WPS has the lead at NATO in setting the WPS agenda, coordinating WPS efforts, and monitoring implementation of WPS efforts throughout the organization. The Special Representative’s main mechanism for carrying this out is the WPS Task Force. Over time, the Task Force should become an incubator of new ideas and a resource of best practices.

The Secretary General should require Divisions to send senior staff to attend WPS Task Force meetings. WPS Task Force meetings should be held less frequently—quarterly at the senior level—to facilitate high level attendance and participation. The SRSG WPS should consider convening monthly meetings at a more junior (programme manager/director) level.

Task Force meetings, particularly those at the senior level, should focus on strategic, substantive and policy priorities. At the beginning of each year, the SRSG WPS should propose a substantive agenda for the Task Force for the year, including time for review and assessment of WPS efforts throughout the organization.

The WPS Task Force should also help to identify WPS projects that could be financed by the Science for Security and Peace (SPS) programme. This is useful because the SPS programme has substantial resources that could advance the WPS agenda.26

Gender Balance on the NATO Staff: NATO’s gender gap, particularly at the leadership level, needs to be addressed immediately.

NATO should develop a pro-active recruitment and retention strategy to address gender imbalances in the organization. To ensure that every hiring and promotion decision takes gender into account, every hiring and promotion panel should include a gender champion—that is, a person who has an explicit, formal designation as a gender champion and the responsibility to examine hiring and promotion proposals from a gender perspective. This cannot be a token formality; it has to be a real responsibility.

Civilian and military managers, including Assistant Secretary Generals, should be evaluated every year on their efforts to increase gender diversity and decrease gender imbalances on their staffs. Every Division should be pushed to think of innovative ways to attract and retain female staff at every level.

NATO’s human resources policies need to be scrubbed from top to bottom to ensure that they are gender-balanced. For example, parental and family leave policies should be available for both men and women.

The Secretary General should insist that the Allies submit gender-diverse lists of candidates (at least one man and one woman) to fill leadership vacancies within the organization.
**Reporting and Assessment:** NATO does not have well-developed templates for reporting and assessing WPS progress. Reporting on WPS activities is ad hoc; it lacks a formal structure and explicit, standard procedures.

The office of the SRSG WPS should provide the Divisions and their GFPs with advice and assistance in developing templates for reporting on gender mainstreaming actions. These templates could focus on five main components:

1. **Organizational Commitment:** Divisions should report on their WPS objectives for the year and the ways in which these objectives have been enunciated and disseminated throughout the Division. They should report on the number and percentage of staff that have participated in NATO and other WPS training and educational opportunities.

2. **Gender Mainstreaming:** Divisions should report comprehensively on the actions they have taken to advance the WPS agenda. Divisions should report on the appointment of a GFP and his/her job description. They should also report on the number and percentage of policy activities that have integrated gender perspectives. They should report on the qualitative aspects of their actions and indicate how they assess the impact of their activities.

3. **The WPS Task Force:** Divisions should report on their staff-level participation and attendance in the WPS Task Force.

4. **Gender Balance:** Divisions should report on gender balances and imbalances within their Division. They should also report on the measures they have taken to remedy gender imbalances.

5. **Resources:** Divisions should report on the amount and percentage of staff and financial resources devoted to advancing the WPS agenda.

Every NATO Division should develop detailed reporting plans. These plans should include practical and realistic actions, timelines and indicators of both a quantitative and a qualitative nature. This will allow the office of the SRSG WPS to systematically monitor WPS progress and identify policy challenges. The creation of standard reporting templates will facilitate assessments within Divisions and across NATO; and it will make it easier for NATO to measure progress over time.

**Resources:** The 2014 Action Plan launched an important and ambitious WPS agenda for the organization. Implementing this agenda requires resources. Rhetorical commitments cannot substitute for real resources—staffing positions and financial resources. Additional WPS resources are needed in the SRSG WPS office and throughout the organization.

The WPS Trust Fund is woefully underfunded. To address this fundamental priority, the Secretary General should identify a near-term target of €2-3 million for the Fund, and he should ask the 55 Allies and Partners to make this an investment priority for 2016-2017. A sustainable WPS commitment will require sustained WPS funding. It is therefore essential that Allies and Partners make allocations to the WPS Trust Fund on an annual basis to enable the Secretary General, the SRSG WPS and the Divisions to carry out this important task.
CONCLUSIONS

This independent assessment has shown that NATO has made tangible progress on the Women, Peace and Security agenda. It is critical that NATO consolidate and build on the efforts undertaken thus far. Further progress will not happen on its own—it will require an explicit, continued commitment from NATO’s leadership; new, enhanced organizational arrangements, including pro-active efforts to redress gender imbalances; and a substantial increase in WPS resources.

NATO HQ cannot make this happen on its own. Fifty-five nations (28 Allies and 27 Partners) have endorsed the 2014 Action Plan. Allies and Partners must step up with additional, ongoing financial commitments to implement their WPS agenda.

If NATO HQ, Allies and Partners take these additional steps, they can live up to the important commitments they have made to advance the Women, Peace and Security agenda. This will be one of the keys to NATO’s ability to carry out its important mission in the 21st century.

As NATO Deputy Secretary General Alexander Vershbow stated in October 2015 at the UN Security Council’s High Level Review of UNSCR 1325 “Improving gender equality within NATO not only improves our credibility; it is essential to our ability to do our job right. Gender equality enhances our ability to respond and to deal with crises. Diversity gives us strength. Being inclusive will allow us to achieve our common goal: lasting peace and security.”

***
ABOUT WIIS

Women In International Security (WIIS) is the premier organization in the world dedicated to advancing the leadership and professional development of women in the field of international peace and security. WIIS (pronounced “wise”) sponsors leadership training, mentoring, and networking programs as well as substantive events focused on current policy problems. WIIS also supports research projects and policy engagement initiatives on critical international security issues, including the nexus between gender and security.
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END NOTES


2 NATO/EAPC Action Plan for the Implementation of the NATO/EAPC Policy on Women, Peace and Security, 2014. The 2014 Action Plan was endorsed by all 28 NATO Member States and the following 27 Partners: Afghanistan, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Finland, Georgia, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Malta, the Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, New Zealand, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, and the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia.

3 On 1 February 2016 I also consulted with Allies and Partners at NATO HQ during a brown-bag lunch organized by the U.S. delegation. For a list of the main documents and other background materials, visit the NATO WPS libguide page at: http://www.natolibguides.info/women/home

4 The 2007 NATO/EAPC Policy on Implementing UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security tasked the Military Authorities to develop a military concept “to mainstream gender issues in the work of the military in all phases of NATO-led Operations and Missions.” See Implementing UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, NATO Document EAPC (C)(2007)0022, 10 December 2007. The Director of the IMS subsequently tasked the Strategic Commands, with Allied Command Operations (ACO) in the lead, to draft Bi-Strategic Command guidelines to implement UNSCR 1325. This led to the Bi-Strategic Command Directive 40-1, Integrating UNSCR 1325 and Gender Perspectives into the NATO Command Structure including measures for protection during armed conflict, 2 September 2009. The Directive was revised on 8 August 2012. A second revision is expected to be released in 2016.

5 See Jens Stoltenberg, NATO Secretary General, Annual Report 2015 (Brussels: NATO HQ, 2016); and Jens Stoltenberg, video message to Georgetown University, 4 December 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rYtoVhRZ8ew

6 The groundwork was put in place by the first SRSG WPS—a position financed by a voluntary national contribution from Norway and announced at NATO’s 2012 summit in Chicago.

7 The 2007 NATO/EAPC policy on WPS was focused almost exclusively on NATO’s military operations in Afghanistan and Kosovo. These WPS efforts were assessed by an outside review in 2013. See Helene Lackenbauer and Richard Langlais, eds., Review of the Practical Implications of UNSCR 1325 for the Conduct of NATO-led Operations and Missions (Sweden: FOI, 2013). This review led to the development of an implementation plan (see note 9). This plan has guided the action of the Strategic Commands.

8 The SPS programme started funding projects with a WPS focus in 2013. In 2013, it funded 1 WPS project out of a total of 51 projects (2%). In 2014, it funded 3 WPS projects out of a total of 74 projects (4%). In 2015, it funded 3 WPS projects out of a total of 48 projects (6%).

9 See ACO/ACT, Bi-SC Implementation Plan of the OPC Recommendations of the Review of the Practical Implications of UNSCR 1325 for the conduct of NATO-led Operations and Missions, 16 September 2013; 7 November 2014; 23 November 2015.


12 The Nordic Center for Gender in Military Operations (NCGM) is based in Sweden. NCGM is the Department Head for gender training in NATO operations. For the national training package, see http://www.act.nato.int/gender-training-documents. See also ACT, Gender in Military Operations Discipline Alignment Plan, 25 November 2015.

13 It included the following exercises: Crisis Management Exercise (CMX15); Trident Jaguar 15; Trident Juncture 15, Trident Joust 15; and Trident Jewel 15.

14 In 2014, the Defence Policy and Planning Division (DPP) included a request in the Defence Planning Capability Survey for Allies and Partners. The survey said: “Please provide an update in your policies related to and implementation of UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security and UNSCR 1612 on Children and Armed Conflict (CAAC) and related resolutions in your armed forces nationally and when contributing in NATO Operations.” In response, 93% of NATO members (25 out of 27 (Iceland does not have a DPCS)) provided an answer in their DPCS regarding their implementation of UNSCR 1325. Allies reported on issues such as: gender awareness in career development and pre-deployment training; gender expertise in the planning and execution of operations; pools of gender specialists, including gender advisors; increasing the participation of female personnel in
multinational operations and the creation of Female Engagement Teams; and the Smart Defence project on Senior Female Leaders in Defence.

15 ACO recently started to develop gender-sensitive early-warning indicators.

16 This is also true for the courses and publications on offer through NATO’s educational and training institutions.

17 See AHWG SALW and Mine Action, Chairman’s Non-Paper on Implementing UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, 1 September 2015.

18 Data with regard to military personnel at NATO HQ is not available to the public.

19 Women at the A7 grade: The SRSG WPS and the Deputy Assistant Secretary General Operations Divisions. Women at the A6 grade: NATO Spokesperson (first female spokesperson); Head of Strategic Analysis Capabilities in the Emerging Security Challenges Division; Secretary of the Council; Head of Operational Preparedness, Operations Division.


21 The exception is the program on Small Arms and Light Weapons in the Arms Control Section. This unit developed a plan for future actions.

22 The WPS Trust Fund is officially known as the Financial Mechanism (FM). It was created in 2013. Iceland, Italy and Norway have contributed to the Trust Fund. In addition, Denmark, Iceland, and Japan pay the salaries for the three staff members made available to the office of the SRSG WPS through Voluntary National Contributions (VNC). VNC travel expenses are paid by the Trust Fund. Communication from the SRSG WPS office, 15 March 2016.

23 See NATO/EAPC Status of Trust Fund Projects as of 2 February 2016 at the NATO website. BI had a projected budget for 2015-2017 of €3.6 million (to be covered by the BI Trust Fund). See NATO-PCSP, Project Proposal Building Integrity Trust Fund Phase III, 2015-2017, Note by the Acting Chairman, 5 February 2015 (AC340-N(2015)0027). The BI programme is a capacity-building programme that aims to provide practical tools and tailor-made assistance to nations – Allies and Partners – to strengthen integrity, transparency and accountability and embed good governance in the defence and security sector. It aims to reduce the risk of corruption in defence institutions of Allies and Partners.

24 The BI Trust Fund and is supported by Belgium, Bulgaria, Norway, Poland, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. In 2016 the Czech Republic and Finland also pledged support.

25 The SPS programme has recently approved the development of a multi-year project on staff training with respect to the WPS agenda. We recommended that this training program be accelerated. NATO HQ should also reach out to ACT for staff training.

26 In 2014, the SPS Budget was €12.1 million.