How can we harness the tremendous knowledge, experiences, and expertise of WILPF’s global community to advocate for a holistic, feminist, and antimilitarist implementation of the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda at the national level, including through National Action Plans (NAPs)?

Seeking to answer this question, in September 2022 WILPF’s WPS Programme (also known as PeaceWomen) facilitated a series of virtual roundtables that created spaces for WILPF members, partners, and staff to share direct experiences and knowledge on the topic of NAPs and WPS.

Grounded in the priorities of the new International Programme, each session encouraged participants to explore a series of questions about Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) role in NAPs, the content of NAPs and our shared goals in advocating for them, and implementation and financing.

The findings emerging from these sessions will serve as the groundwork for ongoing advocacy efforts that link local knowledge produced by Sections and partners to global impact — amplified by the PeaceWomen team’s role as a connector and facilitator.
A Snapshot of Key Findings

The lack of effective, meaningful, substantive inclusion of civil society is a major factor that CSOs believe has hindered progress towards implementation of NAPs. It is also a direct contradiction to the participation pillar of the WPS agenda itself.

There is a misconception that NAPs are primarily useful for countries that are experiencing armed conflict, and are not necessarily needed during “peacetime.”

There are persistently colonial ways of thinking about WPS, including a focus on development and “helping” women abroad with no internal reflection on their domestic situation.

Lack of knowledge about the WPS agenda limits participation from broad civil society; it even hinders government actors from understanding how to develop and implement a comprehensive NAP.

Some NAPs suffer from a lack of qualitative metrics, and focus on quantifying things in ways that don’t reflect women’s experiences and lives. Many lack sufficient financing or staffing for implementation.

Civil society can face barriers to engaging in discussions around “security” because security is seen as an area for government actors only, due to its military connotations.

The roundtables welcomed participants from 26 countries around the world!
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