

# Gender and Security Sector Reform: An Analytical Framework<sup>1</sup>

## DRAFT VERSION

### 1. Background

One of the most vital steps to ensuring the day-to-day security of women, men, boys and girls is to transform the institutions, policies and people who are responsible for the security of communities and individuals: collectively known as the security sector.

**Security sector reform** is the most commonly used term to describe these transformations of the 'security system'.<sup>2</sup> Consensus on the precise definition of the term has yet to be reached; it is employed to describe both single-issue reforms such as disarmament, and comprehensive processes based on broad principles such as good governance.

The definition of **security** conceptually determines the composition, structure and responsibilities of the security sector, as well as the goals of security sector reform. Taking into consideration that the concept of 'security' also remains heavily debated, INSTRAW's working definition of security moves away from traditional militaristic and state-centric definitions of security towards the concept of human security.<sup>3</sup> We define security as encompassing the personal and communal state of being secure from a wide range of critical and pervasive threats, including but not limited to all forms of violence, injustice and violations of human rights. The struggle to ensure the human security of women, men, girls and boys is a potentially emancipatory process that includes at its heart the elimination of unequal and oppressive gender relations.

In turn, the **security sector** is commonly understood to include all the organisations that have the authority to use, or order the use of, force, or the threat of force, to protect individuals and the state (see Box 1). Additionally, unofficial actors play an important role in the security sector, both through their involvement in security sector reform and taking on the position of security providers (see Box 2).

#### BOX 1. THE OFFICIAL SECURITY SECTOR

International/Regional Forces Military/Paramilitary Police Border Guards/Customs Intelligence Services	<b>Group 1</b>
Government Bodies	<b>Group 2</b>
Judicial and Penal Systems	<b>Group 3</b>

#### BOX 2. ADDITIONAL SECURITY SECTOR ACTORS

Civil Society, incl. Media Donors supporting SSR	<b>Group 1</b>
Armed Opposition Groups Private Security Firms	<b>Group 2</b>

<sup>1</sup> Prepared for UN-INSTRAW by Kristin Valasek

<sup>2</sup> The term 'security system reform' is also employed by the OECD and other actors to emphasize a comprehensive approach which addresses all the actors, structures, and relationship among security sector institutions. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development "Security System Reform and Governance: Policy and Good Practice." DAC High Level Meeting, 15-16 April 2004. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/8/39/31785288.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> INSTRAW's definition is based on the concept of human security outlined in the Human Security Now report of the Commission on Human Security (2003). For a more in-depth analysis of gender and human security, see:

- Kristen Timothy. "Engendering Human Security: Intersections of Security, Globalization and Gender." Paper presented at the 8<sup>th</sup> International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women. Kampala, Uganda, 21-26 July 2002.

- Beth Woroniuk. "Women's Empowerment in the Context of Human Security: A Discussion Paper." Bangkok, Thailand, ESCAP, 1999. [http://www.un.org/womenwatch/ianwge/collaboration/Rep1999\\_WE.pdf](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/ianwge/collaboration/Rep1999_WE.pdf)

Without the reform of an inadequate or ineffective security sector, the human right to security<sup>4</sup> [3] often remains dramatically unfulfilled. The consequences can range from the inability to prevent violent conflict, rising criminality, undemocratic governance, unsustainable development, and increasing corruption to repression, torture and harassment of civilians. These consequences often affect women, men, girls and boys in different ways.

Security sector reform is a long-term, holistic process that must be derived from and supported by local communities as well as civilian governance structures. Only through local ownership and a highly participatory process can the **goal of security sector reform** (SSR) be reached: an accountable, equitable, effective, transparent and civilian-controlled security sector that ensures the security and well-being of women, men, girls and boys.

## **A. THE OFFICIAL SECURITY SECTOR**

Despite varying definitions of a state's security sector, it officially includes all the organisations that have the authority to use, or order the use of, force or the threat of force to protect the state and its citizens. In the name of human security, this traditional emphasis on the state and citizens is revised to focus on individuals and communities. Boxes 1 and 2 list the principle actors of the security sector, which are often broken down into subgroups according to their functions. Included below is a full range of security sector actors, whose existence and degree of power differ from community and country depending upon their governance history and legal systems.

The first official group consists of institutions with an official mandate to use violence in order to 'enforce' security: international and regional forces (including peacekeeping missions), military, official paramilitaries, police, border guards, customs authorities and intelligence services, as well as, gendarmeries, presidential guards, coast guards and local security units (national guards, militias), etc.

The second official group is responsible for official oversight through the management and monitoring of the security sector and includes a variety of government bodies: national security advisory bodies, legislature and legislative select committees, ministries of defence, internal affairs, foreign affairs, financial management and parliament or congress.

Finally, the third official group consists of institutions responsible for guaranteeing the rule of law: the judiciary, justice ministries, prisons, criminal investigation and prosecution services, human rights commissions and ombudsmen, customary and traditional justice systems, and international legal institutions.

Though seemingly diverse and disparate, these actors are closely linked and mutually dependent in their joint responsibility to ensure the security of individuals and communities, thereby justifying the shared title of security sector.

## **B. ADDITIONAL SECURITY SECTOR ACTORS**

In addition to these official institutions, other actors play an influential role through taking on the role of security provider and holding the security sector accountable for the security of individuals and communities (see Box 2.).

---

<sup>4</sup> Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 3 "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person." <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>

The first group consists of actors that play a pivotal role in the security sector reform process. They include donors that financially support security sector reforms, ranging from foundation and United Nations funded research on women's police stations, to a recent European Union initiative to support SSR in the Democratic Republic of Congo. National and international civil society also plays a key role in monitoring the security sector, ensuring their accountability, and advocating for security sector reform, including: non-governmental organizations, women's organizations, professional organizations, research institutes, advocacy groups, religious organizations and the media.

The second group, often defined as non-statutory security forces, takes on the role of security provider without an official state mandate, including: armed opposition groups, paramilitaries, private body-guard units, private security companies and political party militia.

### C. SECURITY SECTOR REFORM

Though the recent round of development debate on security sector reform began in the late 1990s,<sup>5</sup> since the inception of the modern state there have always existed efforts to transform the security sector. Peace activists, indigenous groups, ethnic minorities, poor people and women's organizations have consistently and actively challenged the structure, purpose and priorities of the security sector<sup>6</sup> calling for peace, justice, representation and the reduction or elimination of oppressive and inflated militaries.

Donors, states and researchers have recently begun to apply a more **formalised, comprehensive approach to security sector reform** with set goals and methodologies. Despite the ongoing debates on definitions and efficacy, there is often agreement that the SSR agenda must address four key dimensions (political, institutional, economic and societal) and address the security sector as an interconnected whole. This approach to SSR steps away from the focus on single-issue reforms and analyses the security sector as an interdependent system with the aim of implementing a process of reform based upon broad principles turned objectives such good governance, accountability, transparency, etc.<sup>7</sup>

Though no specific international agreements on SSR exist, the growth in research and policies on the topic provides an increasingly large foundation for SSR initiatives. The United Nations, in the form of the UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR), has contributed to this foundation through the establishment of a Justice and Security Sector Reform team along with publishing a paper on their programmatic approach.

Though the **process of security sector reform** varies according to the actors involved, the objective of the reforms, and the specific country or community context,

#### BOX 3. SECURITY SECTOR REFORM: AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

<b>General Objective:</b>	Accountability
<b>Specific Objective :</b>	Improve Public Expenditure Management
<b>Specific Reforms to be Implemented :</b>	Reform of resource distribution; advanced pay roll systems; strategic planning exercises; monitoring systems; budget training; yearly review processes; evaluations and audits; quotas to include women in decision-making positions; adequately budget for gender training and gender experts.

<sup>5</sup> Herbert Wulf. Security Sector Reform in Developing Countries. Eschborn: GTZ, 2000. p. 13. [http://www.gtz.de/security-sector/download/GTZ\\_SSR\\_Engl.pdf](http://www.gtz.de/security-sector/download/GTZ_SSR_Engl.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> Vanessa A. Farr. Voices from the Margins: A response to Security sector reform in developing and transitional countries. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. pp. 2-3. [http://www.berghof-handbook.net/articles/ssr\\_farr.pdf](http://www.berghof-handbook.net/articles/ssr_farr.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Bonn Center for Conversion. Conversion Survey 2004: Global Disarmament, Demilitarization and Demobilization. Baden Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 2004. p. 58

certain stages are common to many SSR processes. The UK Department for International Development (DFID) describes this process from the perspective of a donor in their guidelines on SSR, including key steps such as: informal or formal consultations; a general diagnosis including identifying and determining which entry-point/s to address;<sup>8</sup> specific assessments or reviews; stakeholder meetings; implementation; monitoring; and evaluation.<sup>9</sup>

The objectives of the process of SSR, as well as the specific context, determine **specific security sector reforms**. Due to the breadth of actors involved in the security sector, and the wide variety of objectives, specific reforms can range from drafting and implementing legislation mandating civilian oversight of the military, and training the judiciary to address stalking and domestic violence, to quota systems that increase female or minority representation within the police (see Box 3).

Security sector reform initiatives are often directed towards developing countries as part of development, reconstruction or conflict prevention initiatives. However, it must also be acknowledged that SSR processes are often just as relevant to developed countries, as police brutality in the United States, racial profiling in Britain, and the global lack of prevention and response to violence against women, demonstrate. Security sectors in developing countries are not fully meeting the basic security needs of communities and individuals, and they constitute the highest spenders on armaments and military budgets. Global military spending effectively increased by eighteen percent in two years, rising to US\$ 956 billion in 2003, with USA, Japan, UK, France, China topping the charts.<sup>10</sup>

Security sector reform is simply one part of the process of guaranteeing the day-to-day human security of individuals and communities. The security sector and SSR are constantly influenced by global and national factors, from increases in bi-lateral military aid or military invasions at the international level, to growing rates of femicide within specific communities. With the increasing inter-dependency of global security, events such as the terrorism of 9/11 and 11-M have global consequences that include soaring military expenditures and the curtailment of the rights of citizens. While SSR can transform state, and to a certain degree international, responses to these complex security issues, it only limitedly addresses the root causes of the broad spectrum of security threats. The lack of access to employment, education, and potable water are examples of core threats to human security that are indirectly related to SSR and are essential to address in coordination with security sector reforms. SSR, though only one of the many steps necessary to ensuring human security, can help create safe spaces for development initiatives to sustainably take root and flourish.

Unfortunately, the emerging field of security sector reform remains largely blind to issues of gender and women's security. As SSR is increasingly legitimised as a crucial realm for development, reconstruction and conflict prevention work it is essential that we develop the tools, methodologies and theories to ensure that gender is analysed, addressed and mainstreamed into all SSR initiatives in order to ensure the right to security for women, men, girls and boys as well as to create a just, democratic and effective security sector. The following section presents a brief overview of the relationship between gender and SSR processes, as well as an analytical Gender Framework that allows us to identify strategic entry points for promoting positive change.

---

<sup>8</sup> DFID identified seven areas most likely to serve as entry points: building public awareness and engagement; building strategic planning capacity; strengthening legal and constitutional frameworks; strengthening civil oversight mechanisms; strengthening financial management systems; facilitating war-to-peace transitions; and improving human resource management.

<sup>9</sup> UK Department for International Development (DFID). Understanding and Supporting Security Sector Reform. DFID. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/supportingsecurity.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. "Highlights from the SIPRI YEARBOOK 2004." SIPRI Yearbook 2004: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security. Stockholm: SIPRI, 2004.

## 2. Framework

A thorough analysis and integration of gender in security sector reform initiatives and processes will strengthen efforts to ensure the right to security for women, men, girls and boys as well as to create a just, democratic and effective security sector.

At a fundamental level, integrating a gender perspective in security sector reform means asking questions such as: How is security defined? Whose security? Who should legitimately participate in decision-making within the security sector? What is the role of the security sector in preventing violence against women? Why is there such over-representation of men in the security sector and SSR processes? How can the security sector play a role in changing harmful gender stereotypes and cultures of violence?

These questions are seldom asked and the words 'women', 'girls', 'gender', and 'masculinities' are rarely mentioned within the realm of security sector reform, despite a well articulated and active discourse on gender and women's issues in relation to specific security sector organizations, especially the military and the police. In last the two years, only a handful of case studies, reports and articles have dealt directly with the topic. The result is a gender-blind security sector that is often shaped by its idealization of hegemonic models of violent masculinity based on aggression and response<sup>11</sup> and that often fails to meet the needs of women, girls, and marginalized men and boys.

### A. WHY IS GENDER RELEVANT TO SSR?

The security needs of women, girls and marginalized men and boys are often criminally neglected. Violence against women remains one of the largest global threats to the human security of women, yet security sector institutions fall short in the prevention of and response to these crimes. Security sector institutions, policies and personnel are themselves often a direct threat to the security of women and girls. Cultures of violence and oppressive gender roles have resulted in high rates of sexual violence perpetrated by military and police officials and the unofficial sanctioning of military recruitment of male and female child soldiers.

Security sector reform from a gender perspective involves implementing gendered initiatives at the structural, policy and personnel level, including reforms in order to halt internal violence, human rights abuses and discrimination. The security needs of women, men, boys and girls are diverse and vary according to a variety of factors. Integrating gender in order to meet women and girls' specific security needs include such initiatives as: integrating domestic violence prevention programmes into the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) process and ensuring a just legal process for female survivors of sexual violence.

A participatory, transparent and accountable security sector that will adequately address the security needs of all includes the full and equal participation of women in decision-making positions and processes. If not entirely banned from participation, women are notably absent from decision-making positions. Ethnicity, sexual-orientation, class, etc. are additional barriers to participation in decision-making. Initiatives to ensure a democratic and participatory security sector include: reforming hiring policies and recruitment processes, implementing quota systems and internal codes of conduct with zero-tolerance towards discrimination, violence or sexual harassment.

---

<sup>11</sup> Hegemonic models of masculinity refer to the most prevalent and accepted, socially-constructed stereotype of masculinity within a specific culture and time. Many times these dominant models of masculinity value aggression and condone violence.

The inclusion of gender and women's issues in the security sector, and human security initiatives in general, is mandated by various international agreements. Key documents include: *The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (1979); the *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women* (1994); the *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action* (1995); the *Windhoek Declaration and the Namibia Plan of Action on Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective in Multidimensional Peace Support Operations* (2000); *Security Council Resolution 1325 "Women, Peace and Security"* (2000); *UN General Assembly Resolution of the twenty-third special session "Further actions and initiatives to implement the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action"* (2000); the *Commission on the Status of Women Agreed Conclusions on "Women's equal participation in conflict prevention, management and conflict resolution and post-conflict peace-building"* (2004).

Though none of these existing international agreements specifically employ the terms 'security sector' or 'security sector reform,' they call for gender mainstreaming, equal and full participation of women, and a focus on violence against women within all the specific institutions of the security sector. Additionally, measures to ensure peace and security such as disarmament and reducing excessive military expenditure are repeatedly highlighted.

Many internal and external barriers hinder the creation of a participatory, transparent, accountable and effective security sector that adequately prevents and responds to the insecurities of women, men, girls and boys. Internally, the structure, policies and organisational culture of security sector institutions are often sexist, condone and perpetuate violence, and are exclusionary of any and all that do not fit culturally dominant models of masculinity. Externally, barriers include cultural gender stereotypes that construct femininity as weak, passive and dependant and masculinity as active, stronger and violent, as well as cultures of violence that condone violence as an acceptable form of conflict resolution. Gender perspectives serve to shed light, analyse and present solutions in order to overcome these barriers and create a security sector that is modelled on and promotes positive and flexible gender roles, a culture of non-violence and peaceful conflict resolution.

## **B. GENDERING SECURITY SECTOR REFORM**

Unfortunately, there is no easy formula for incorporating gender issues into security sector reform processes and initiatives. Gendered reforms are implemented within specific contexts where local and national support and ownership are vital. As a first step in exploring how to gender security sector reform, the following framework of analysis is proposed to address gender and the process of security sector reform, the principles of security sector reform, and common security sector reforms.

**Incorporating gender into the process of security sector reform** entails ensuring the full and equal participation of women, girls and marginalized men and boys in order to take into account their different experiences, needs, priorities and actions. Two questions are of particular importance to guaranteeing full participation and the incorporation of gender issues in the process of SSR: i) What are the barriers? and ii) How do we integrate gender issues?

Box 4 provides an example of incorporating gender into one step of the SSR process – namely assessments - as identified by DFID in their guidelines on SSR. This process can include: informal or formal consultations; a general diagnosis including identifying and

determining which entry-point/s to address; specific assessments or reviews; stakeholder meetings; implementation; monitoring; and evaluation.<sup>12</sup>

In order to effectively initiate the process of incorporating gender into security sector reform this gender framework begins with **an analysis of the barriers to women and girls' ability to participate in and benefit from SSR** (see Table 1.). Though marginalized men and boys also face distinct threats to their security and barriers to their participation in SSR, the following framework focuses on women and girls because they remain the largest and most vulnerable group of marginalized individuals.

In order to identify the full range of gender barriers, the analysis is conducted at the two levels at which SSR is conceptualized: (a) the level of broader underlying principles such as accountability, transparency and democratic governance; and (b) the level of practical implementation of common security sector reforms. This dual focus ensures that gender is not only mainstreamed into existing SSR initiatives, but that larger social and cultural barriers are also identified and addressed.

Table 1 uses one example at each of the two levels, democratic governance and professionalization of a ministry of defence, in order to identify some of the barriers faced at both the conceptual and practical levels.

**TABLE 1 - BARRIERS TO GENDERING SECURITY SECTOR REFORM**

Barriers to Women As Actors	Barriers to Women and Girls as Beneficiaries
<b>Democratic Governance</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of education opportunities;</li> <li>- Social and cultural discrimination and stereotypes regarding women's participation in politics and the field of security;</li> <li>- Violence and sexual harassment against women working in the security sector;</li> <li>- Lack of programmes, policies or mechanisms to ensure that women are equally represented in decision-making bodies;</li> <li>- Insular structure that prevents the participation of civil society, including women's organisations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of funding budgeted towards gender-specific initiatives and gender mainstreaming efforts;</li> <li>- Lack of gender expertise;</li> <li>- Lack of implementation of international agreements (Beijing, SCR 1325, etc);</li> <li>- Lack of mechanisms to ensure that women and girls' needs are being addressed.</li> </ul>

**BOX 4. GENDER AND THE SSR PROCESS:  
an illustrative example of gendering SSR assessments**

- 1) *What are the barriers?*
  - a) Assessment materials, surveys, etc. that do not address the insecurities of women and girls and marginalized men and boys.
  - b) Assessment teams without gender expertise.
  - c) Insufficient number of female staff.
  - d) Cultural and logistical barriers that prevent the voices of women, girls and marginalized men and boys from being heard and taken into account.
- 2) *How do we integrate gender issues?*
  - a) *Including women, girls and marginalized men and boys*
    - Specific consultations set up with women, girls and marginalized men and boys;
    - Group meeting held at times and places that are convenient for women, girls and marginalized men and boys and sex-segregated if needed;
    - Sex-disaggregated statistics mapping assessment process;
    - Female and marginalized men included as part of the assessment team and translators.
  - b) *Incorporating gender perspectives*
    - Assessment materials/studies/surveys gendered i.e. including questions regarding violence against women, discrimination against minority groups etc;
    - Gendered assessment methodology;
    - Assessment team includes people with gender expertise.

<sup>12</sup> Department for International Development (DFID). Understanding and Supporting Security Sector Reform. DFID. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/supportingsecurity.pdf>

Professionalizing a Ministry of Defense	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sexist organisational culture, including ‘old boy’s networks’ that prevents female staff mobility;</li> <li>- Social and cultural discrimination and stereotypes regarding women’s participation in politics and the field of security;</li> <li>- Hiring processes and job profiles that serve to exclude women;</li> <li>- Discrimination, sexual harassment and violence against female staff;</li> <li>- Lack of programmes, policies or mechanisms to ensure that women are equally represented in decision-making bodies;</li> <li>- Insular structure that hinders the participation of civil society, including women’s organizations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organisational culture of gender-blindness including a lack of gender expertise within the Ministry;</li> <li>- Lack of women and/or gender experts on civilian review boards;</li> <li>- Lack of action plans for the implementation of international agreements;</li> <li>- Lack of policies mandating the inclusion of women and girls’ needs within Ministry initiatives;</li> <li>- Lack of funding budgeted towards gender-specific initiatives and gender mainstreaming efforts.</li> </ul>

An analysis of the barriers to women’s participation in the security sector and SSR processes, as well as the status of women and girls as beneficiaries of the security sector sheds light on strategic entry points for the incorporation of gender. Taking into consideration these barriers allows for the identification of **potential reforms at the broad, conceptual level** as well as at the level of practical implementation. The select of which gendered reforms to implement are of course dependent upon the specific context and local and national support and ownership is vital. In the context of democratic governance, these include a wide range of reforms from the development of rigorously applied internal codes of conduct and new recruitment policies to the designation of funds for gender-specific initiatives and mandatory gender training for decision-makers (see Table 2.).

Women As Actors		Women and Girls as Beneficiaries	
Barriers	Reforms	Barriers	Reforms
1. Lack of education opportunities;	a. Incentives for women to study the field of politics and security;	1. Lack of funding budgeted towards gender-specific initiatives and gender mainstreaming efforts;	a. Gender auditing budgets; b. Specific funds designated for gender-specific initiatives and gender mainstreaming efforts
2. Social and cultural discrimination and stereotypes regarding women’s participation in politics and the field of security;	a. National awareness raising campaigns on equal rights and women’s political participation b. Capacity-building on gender for human resources personnel, supervisors and staff in general	2. Lack of gender expertise;	a. Mandatory gender training for decision-makers
3. Violence and sexual harassment against women working in the security sector	a. Rigorously applied internal codes of conduct and/or internal policies of zero-tolerance towards discrimination, violence and sexual harassment of women	3. Lack of implementation of international agreements (Beijing, SCR 1325, etc)	a. National action plans drafted, funded and acted upon to ensure the implementation of international agreements

4. Lack of programmes, policies or mechanisms to ensure that women are equally represented in decision-making bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Quota systems to ensure equal representation of women in decision-making positions;</li> <li>b. New recruitment policies and processes implemented</li> </ul>	4. Lack of mechanisms to ensure that women and girls' needs are being addressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Policies mandating the inclusion of women and girls' needs in decision-making regarding security</li> <li>b. Gender audits to monitor and evaluate the effect of policies and initiatives upon women and girls</li> </ul>
5. Insular structure that prevents the participation of civil society, including women's organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Mechanisms to ensure the participation of civil society in decision-making, including civilian review boards and stakeholder meetings</li> </ul>		

While a gendered analysis of the underlying principles of SSR takes into account the entire spectrum of gendered reforms, a **gendered analysis of the implementation of these reforms at the practical level** allows for the identification of concrete policies and actions. These reforms can be part of a larger, holistic process of security sector reform, or can constitute a single-issue reform. The examples in Table 3 centres on ensuring women and girls' ability to participate in and benefit from SSR - focusing specifically on professionalizing a ministry of defence.

Women As Actors		Women and Girls as Beneficiaries	
Barriers	Reforms	Barriers	Reforms
1. Discrimination, sexual harassment and violence against female staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Internal code of conduct and/or internal policies of zero-tolerance towards discrimination, sexual harassment and violence against women drafted and implemented</li> </ul>	1. Organisational culture of gender-blindness including a lack of gender expertise within the Ministry; experts on civilian review boards;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Create a gender unit and/or hire staff with gender expertise;</li> <li>b. Gender training;</li> </ul>
2. Sexist organisational culture, including 'old boys' networks' that prevents female staff mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Programmes implemented to give young, female professionals work experience at the Ministry;</li> </ul>	2. Lack of women and/or gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Quotas to ensure women's participation on civilian review boards</li> </ul>
3. Lack of programmes, policies or mechanisms to ensure that women are equally represented in decision-making bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Rigorously applied internal codes of conduct and/or internal policies of zero-tolerance towards discrimination, violence and sexual harassment of women</li> <li>b. Quota system instituted for decision-making positions</li> </ul>	3. Lack of action plans for the implementation of international agreements (Beijing, SCR 1325, etc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Action plans for the implementation of international agreements</li> </ul>

4. Insular structure that hinders the participation of civil society, including women's organizations	a. Mechanisms to ensure the participation of civil society in decision-making, including civilian review boards and stakeholder meetings	4. Lack of policies and processes ensuring the inclusion of women and girls' needs within Ministry initiatives	a. Policies mandating the inclusion of women and girls' needs; b. Mechanisms for women's organisations and civil society to dialogue with the ministry
		5. Lack of funding budgeted towards gender-specific initiatives and gender mainstreaming efforts	a. Funding specifically designated towards gender-specific initiatives

### C. FUTURE AREAS FOR RESEARCH AND CAPACITY-BUILDING

Though feminist and gender-focused activists and researchers have applied a gender perspective to specific security sector institutions for decades, the emerging discourse on security sector reform has remained largely gender-blind. As was previously mentioned, only a handful of case studies, reports and articles have dealt directly with the topic of integrating gender into SSR. **Future research and capacity-building priorities** that build upon the foundation of existing research and good practices include:

- In-depth research on existing good practices regarding gendered reforms of the security sector, including comparative case studies;
- Theoretical approach developed to integrating gender into the underlying principles of security sector reform: good governance, transparency, accountability, public participation, etc;
- Drafting and field testing of guidelines for the integration of gender into security sector reform process;
- The development of capacity-building materials and processes to integrate gender into the work of security sector reform professionals;
- A comparative study of existing gender mainstreaming training materials directed towards security sector institutions to determine their effectiveness, for example peacekeeping forces or militaries;
- Building upon the previous study, develop effective models of gender mainstreaming training materials and test them in 2-3 different countries;
- A study of existing gender policies within security sector institutions, for example the police or the military, and their effectiveness in augmenting women's full and equal participation and the integration of gender issues;
- Review of existing materials on transforming gendered cultures of violence and the development and testing of capacity-building processes and materials to transform violent, oppressive models of masculinity within security sector institutions.