

FEMCIT IP
Contract No. 028746

WP7
Working Paper No. 4

Hilda Rømer Christensen:

Mainstreaming Gender, Diversity and Citizenship:
Concepts and Methodologies

University of Copenhagen

January 2011
Revised March 2011

FEMCIT Gender Mainstreaming Report

Hilda Rømer Christensen, PhD, Associate professor,

Head of the Co-ordination for Gender Research, Copenhagen University

Michala Hvidt Breengard, cand.scient.soc., Research Assistant,

The Co-ordination for Gender Research, Copenhagen University

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	7
INTRODUCTION	8
SUMMARY OF THE GENDER MAINSTREAMING REPORT	12
METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK	13
THE DATA COLLECTION	15
CHAPTER 1: GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND MULTIPLE INEQUALITIES. THE POLITICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE EU	20
GENDER MAINSTREAMING AS A TRAVELLING AND CONTESTED STRATEGY	21
<i>The politics of Multiple Inequalities in the EU</i>	24
<i>The European Year of Equal Opportunities for all</i>	26
<i>Gender mainstreaming and soft governance in the EU</i>	29
CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUAL DISCOURSES AND MODELS OF GENDER MAINSTREAMING	30
<i>Gender mainstreaming as a mobilising and participatory tool</i>	32
<i>Intersectionality and gender mainstreaming</i>	37
“WHAT ARE WE MAINSTREAMING WHEN WE MAINSTREAM GENDER?”	40
PERSPECTIVES AND IMPLICATIONS.....	42
CHAPTER 3: GENDER MAINSTREAMING: LOST OR MULTIPLIED IN TRANSLATION – INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES AND DILEMMAS	44
CONTRASTING PRACTICES AND DIFFERENT IDEAS	46
PROCESSES OF TRANSLATION.....	49
THE NOTION OF GENDER MAINSTREAMING	51
<i>Notions of equality</i>	54
FROM GENDER TO DIVERSITY	56
<i>Structural and organizational resistance</i>	57
FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE – EXAMPLES OF IMPLEMENTATION.....	60
GENDER BUDGETING.....	61
<i>Austria</i>	63
<i>Germany</i>	64
<i>Poland</i>	65
<i>Spain</i>	66
<i>Norway</i>	66
CONCLUSION	67
CHAPTER 4: GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND THE BEIJING +15 PROCESS AS COMMUNICATIVE EVENTS... 70	
<i>The Beijing +15 events consisted in the following highlights:</i>	71
FROM BEIJING TO NEW YORK – AN EMOTIONAL AND POLITICAL JOURNEY	72
<i>Voices and speeches from 1995-2010</i>	72
<i>Soft Governance at the UN level</i>	75
<i>The Making of Gender Mainstreaming</i>	77
<i>Beijing Platform at a Cross Road?</i>	80
FROM BEIJING TO BRUSSELS: THE EUROPEAN WOMEN’S LOBBY AND THE BEIJING REVIEWS	83
THE EWL AND THE BEIJING + PROCESSES	85
<i>The EWL Beijing reviews</i>	85
<i>The EWL and the Beijing + 5 Review</i>	87
<i>The EWL and the Beijing + 10 Review</i>	89
<i>Gender Mainstreaming in the EWL Beijing + 10 Review</i>	90
<i>The EWL position in the Beijing + 15 report</i>	92
<i>Gender mainstreaming in the Beijing + 15 report</i>	94
BEYOND THE BEIJING + REVIEWS: MULTIPLE DISCRIMINATION AND INTERSECTIONAL POLITICS IN THE EWL.....	95
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	101
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	105

REFERENCES.....	108
ANNEX 1: MAPPING GENDER MAINSTREAMING INITIATIVES IN THE EU COUNTRIES	119
ANNEX 2: INTERVIEW GUIDE – PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.....	125
ANNEX 3: INTERVIEW GUIDE – NGOS.....	126
ANNEX 4: QUESTIONNAIRE – PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	127
ANNEX 5: QUESTIONNAIRE – NGOS.....	133
ANNEX 6: LIST OF INTERVIEWS	137
ANNEX 7: COLLECTED REPORTS AND OTHER MATERIAL.....	138

Executive summary

- This report focus on gender mainstreaming as a dimension of gender-fair citizenship. Gender mainstreaming emerged as a new global equality strategy 1995 and was carried at the Fourth UN World Conference in the so-called *Beijing Platform of Action*. At the EU level the notion was endorsed during the late 1990s and implemented in the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997.
- Gender mainstreaming can (in its most promising form) be seen as a political methodology able to address and intervene in the complicated governance structures of gender equality in the 21st century. In the European context, gender mainstreaming during the last 15 years has ventured for a double goal: a pledge for women's participation in public and legal affairs, and for the inclusion of a gender dimension open for analytical and transformative developments in any political process.
- The report has outlined and complicated existing models and approaches to gender mainstreaming and addressed the upcoming diversity approach, which seeks to integrate multiple discrimination grounds in mainstreaming efforts. The report has dealt with how gender is defined and negotiated in a range of institutions and in relation to political issues, as well as the emergent development of new theoretical and practical tools to enhance the intersection of gender, ethnicity and social class.
- Departing from the two pronged model: 1) an expert- or bureaucratic model and 2) a participatory-democratic model, the report has explored how both the EU and the national governments have mainly practiced the strategy of gender mainstreaming as a bureaucratic model, while under-prioritizing the mobilizing and democratic orientated aspects.
- The implementation of gender mainstreaming in the political framework of the EU and its member states has extended new partnerships between key agents in the making of equality politics in the so-called velvet triangles of agents in movements, institutions and research. It here seems as if the former division of labour between women's movements, political institutions and knowledge producers have been blurred and relocated along with the implementation of gender mainstreaming.
- Gender mainstreaming has been implemented in new (neo-liberal) compartmentalised policy processes, reviews and hearings, which in principle contain new opportunity structures for NGOs. Yet the new governance structures have also produced diffuse and unclear multilevel policy processes and made it difficult for less resourced NGOs to be heard.
- Gender mainstreaming has during the Beijing + 15 reviews been maintained as the most important and overarching long-term equality strategy at both at the UN, the EU and at many

national levels. Yet, the lack of progress and resources also seem to spur a return to single issues and less co-ordinated activities and goals.

Acknowledgements

About this Report

This report is written by Hilda Rømer Christensen and Michala Hvidt Breengaard as part of the FEMCIT project. It has to a great extent been a shared project with a certain division of work.

Hence Michala Hvidt Breengaard is the main author of *Chapter 3. Gender mainstreaming Lost of Multiplied in Translation. Institutional Practices and Dilemmas* and the qualitative and quantitative data collection on which the chapter is based while Hilda Rømer Christensen is the main author of *Chapter 4. Gender mainstreaming and the Beijing + Process as Communicative Events*.

Besides the completement of the FEMCIT report has been assisted by the following:

Student assistant Anna Maj Wilroth has made the initial compilation and introduction to *Annex 1: Mapping Gender Mainstreaming initiatives in the EU countries*.

Interviews have been transcribed by student assistant Amal Al-Ghazal while research assistant Mathilde Holmen has assisted with copy editing and lay-out.

The qualitative and quantitative data collection on national practices of gender mainstreaming in a range of EU countries, was funded by the *Research priority area at University of Copenhagen: Europe in Change*. It was conducted in 2008 by Michala Hvidt Breengaard and the results were compiled in a preliminary report *Europe as a Laboratory of the World? Gender mainstreaming, women's movements and equality for all in the 21. Century*. University of Copenhagen 2008. The rest of the interviews with EU experts and with EU level NGOs as well as observation studies of Beijing related conferences have been conducted during 2009 and 2010.

While we would like to convey our thanks to all for their valuable and committed contributions, special appreciation goes to:

- the many organisations, NGOs and officials who took time and effort to provide us with printed material and interviews.
- the FEMCIT partners and colleagues who offered valuable and inspiring comments to the draft versions of this report: Professor Dr. Beatrice Halsaa, Oslo University, Director of NIKK Dr. Solveig Bergman and FEMCIT scientific co-ordinator Dr. Sevil Sümer, Bergen University.

Introduction



The purpose of this report is to focus on gender mainstreaming as a dimension of gender-fair citizenship. Gender mainstreaming emerged as a new global equality strategy in 1995. It was carried at the Fourth UN World Conference on Women in the Beijing Platform for Action. The notion was endorsed by the EU during the late 1990s, and implemented in the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997. The term “gender mainstreaming” can be seen as an umbrella, covering several concepts that forefront the importance of gender and equality in all policy creation. The aim of gender mainstreaming is gender justice and gender equality, achieved by challenging patriarchal and genderless norms in mainstream policy and thought, and by the mobilisation of various agents in public institutions and civil society. These are features that in some respects converge with the ideal of a gender-fair citizenship for all.

The report forms part of the FEMCIT project, a multi-disciplinary and multi-dimensional research project financed by the EU FP 6 Research Programme. The aim of FEMCIT has been to explore complex relationships between gendered citizenship and contemporary women’s movements. Accordingly, the FEMCIT project has examined relationships between (a) forms and practices of gendered citizenship in multicultural Europe, and (b) the demands and practices which have emerged from women’s movements in the period since the 1960s. FEMCIT has operated with a list of thematic areas and cross-cutting perspectives of importance for the analysis and future visions of gender-fair citizenship in Europe. FEMCIT has provided fresh studies of liberal citizenship in the late 20th century, such as political, economical and social citizenship; and it has explored new and emerging dimensions, such as ethnic, religious, bodily and intimate citizenship.

Gender mainstreaming can (in its most promising form) be seen as a political methodology able to address and intervene in the complicated governance structures of gender equality in the 21st century. But it can also be regarded as a new and contested buzzword that might hamper existing equality strategies and goals. In the European context, gender mainstreaming during the last 15 years has ventured for a double goal: a pledge for women’s participation in public and legal affairs, and for the inclusion of a gender dimension open for analytical and transformative developments in any political process.

The report shall explore and enhance existing models and approaches to gender mainstreaming and address the upcoming diversity approach, which seeks to integrate multiple discrimination grounds in mainstreaming efforts. The report aims at developing the knowledge basis of the mainstreaming strategy that has been called for by institutions and researchers. This includes knowledge of how gender is defined and negotiated in a range of institutions and in relation to political issues, as well as the emergent development of new theoretical and practical tools to enhance the intersection of gender, ethnicity and social class.

The focus will be on the dynamic and contested processes between women's movements (and other NGOs) and the politics and administration at European and selected national levels. In doing so, the report extends the focus of the FEMCIT project to include the notion and practice of gender mainstreaming, thereby addressing the following questions:

- How are gender mainstreaming strategies, tools and practices formed, translated and negotiated in current governance processes at EU and at national levels?
- How have institutions and women's collective agency and mobilisations been staged; and how have they contributed to notions, practice and criticism of gender mainstreaming?
- How can the idea of gender mainstreaming advance ideas and practice of gender-fair citizenship?

Citizenship and gender mainstreaming are two terms with different connotations and roots. Since at least the French Revolution, citizenship has been a strong term in European history and society, pursued as a normative ideal of change, rights and democracy. By contrast, gender mainstreaming was conceived in response to late 20th century policy making, as a new and holistic strategy able to challenge and change patriarchal norms. However, gender mainstreaming might contain a range of possibilities for supplementing and strengthening the general idea of gender-fair citizenship. As such we see the ideas of gender-fair citizenship and gender mainstreaming as both converging and containing different strengths and possibilities.

The FEMCIT project, not least the extensive empirical evidence sampled during the research-process, has refined and moderated certain optimistic assumptions about both concepts. While both citizenship and gender mainstreaming have been centrally positioned in the FEMCIT proposal, both ideas have also been invested with some ambivalence, as evidenced in the empirical findings. Citizenship seems not to be directly applied by contemporary stakeholders and movements. Indeed, it has even been labelled as "foreign to women's and feminist movements". Similarly, gender mainstreaming has had low attention and been treated as a "non issue" in both the thematic work packages and the overall FEMCIT activities (Halsaa and Sümer 2010: 15).

When confronted with these interpretations, certain questions immediately arise: Do citizenship and gender mainstreaming form an overly distant backstage to everyday experiences? Do they form overly broad and elusive agendas for current activists and movements? Should the idea of gender mainstreaming, against this background, be discarded as just another version of European elitism and Euro governance? Or should gender mainstreaming be recognised as an idea that belongs to a different (and perhaps even utopian) avenue, which might be only rudimentarily linked to the pragmatics of day-to-day politics? That is, if the idea were taken in its substantial meaning would it become the "*politics of the impossible*"? Or should gender mainstreaming (in a rather pathetic gesture) be seen as a

“*vanishing point*” in the sense of Chantal Mouffe: i.e., as something similar to the “common good” that we must constantly refer to, redirect and change, but that can never be reached? (Mouffe 1992: 379)

By now gender mainstreaming has been subject to extensive research with different focus, angles and interests.¹ An interesting and important research project is Mary Daly’s assesment of progress and impact of gender mainstreaming in eight countries: Belgium, France, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, Spain, Sweden an the UK. Daly finds a tendency of “technocratization” of the gender mainstreaming strategy and identifies three variations of gender mainstreaming approaches: 1) An integrated approach, which is only found in Sweden. 2) A so-called “mainstreaming light”, which is found in Belgium and Ireland and which indicates little more than involvement of different government departments in the implementation of a program around gender equality. 3) A fragmented version where gender mainstreaming is confined to a small number of policy domains. France and the UK are examples of this version. Daly points at that gender mainstreaming is a fuzzy concept and argues that there is a need to develop more theory on how gender mainstreaming relates to gender equality as a societal phenomenon (Sümer 2009: 82).

Another important study by Maria Stratigaki has analysed gender mainstreaming vs. positive actions as an ongoing conflict in EU gender policy. In her study Stratigaki discusses how positive action was sidelined after the launch of gender mainstreaming as a result of the specific way gender mainstreaming was used by the opponents of gender equality. Stratigaki’s analysis shows how the negotiations around the development of gender mainstreaming policies have evolved and demonstrates the importance of the agency of key women politicians. Stratigaki argues that an obstacle to gender mainstreaming, understood as a strategy to fundamental change, is that it clashes with dominant policy frames of the EU (Sümer 2009: 83).

Also Lombardo and Meier have pointed on inconsistencies and ambiguities in EU policies that challenge the strategy of gender mainstreaming. Based on findings from an EU project, which analysed policy frames and implementation problems for gender mainstreaming (MAGEEQ), Lombardo and Meier argue that the definition of gender mainstreaming of the Council of Europe is an empty concept. That is, that the main focus has been on procedural changes whereas little attention has been made to define what we should understand by a gender equality perspective (Sümer 2009: 84).

In line with Sylvia Walby, Teresa Rees, Sevil Sümer and several others we find it worthwhile to explore the political and theoretical implications of gender mainstreaming. Moreover, we find it interesting to consider the role of gender mainstreaming in the relocation of feminism and feminist analysis in the contemporary era (Walby 2005, Rees 2002, Sümer 2009). Accordingly, this report contributes to the departing question of FEMCIT: How can one advance public understanding of the need for wider gender-fairness that goes beyond current notions? This report is focused on how to analyse and

¹ For an extensive mapping of existing gender-mainstreaming research, see Jämi Report (2009).

advance processes of policy-making, and how gender mainstreaming can contribute new understanding of the choices and dilemmas inherent in the advancement of gender-fair citizenship for all (FEMCIT Policy Document 2010).

Summary of the gender mainstreaming report

The report begins, in the remainder of this introduction, with a presentation of the data collection and the methodological framework. The first chapter outlines the political framework of gender mainstreaming and multiple inequalities in the EU. The focus will be on how gender mainstreaming and multiple inequality respectively has been brought into the political agenda and how these frameworks interfere with wider ideas of governance and citizenship in multicultural Europe. In the second chapter we discuss the conceptual discourses and models of gender mainstreaming. This implies a presentation of two models of gender mainstreaming and an aim to settle notions of gender mainstreaming in perspectives that go beyond the either/or dichotomies.

In the following chapters we intend to substantiate the advancement and modification of these methodological and theoretical insights in a range of case studies, providing new understanding to the practice of gender mainstreaming. We intend to handle events and developments as related communicative actions and networks of public events, rather than as isolated incidents or developments.

In chapter 3, we shall focus on how gender mainstreaming is perceived and produced in range of governmental units and NGOs in a selection of nation states in Europe. This includes consideration of the role of bureaucracies and women's movements, of coalition building and accomplishments in the context of national genealogies of gender and equality.

In chapter 4, we shall explore a second case: the ongoing evaluation of the Beijing Platform in the so-called Beijing + 15 events, viewed as communicative events, with different positions and accomplishments of gender mainstreaming being staged in extensive reports and major global conferences. Both events and reports will be considered as locations for the creation and negotiation of power and hegemony: between radical, moderate and conservative communities and convictions; and between NGOs and established organisations such as the UN and the EU.

In the conclusion we summarize the findings of the report and present a list of policy recommendations.

Methodological framework

In this report we have been inspired by the method of critical discourse analysis as a means to study the ways in which dominance and inequality are enacted, produced and resisted through text and talk and a range of other semiotic modalities, such as images and gestures in the social and political context (Dijk 2001/2004: 1, Fairclough 2006: 271- 280). We will approach a variety of contexts from different angles to explore how gender mainstreaming is defined, practised and problematised in policy and implementation processes, since we understand these processes as important aspects that influence the content and impact of the strategy.

Critical discourse analysis represents a particular mode of discourse analysis in the varied landscape of current analytical strategies. Following Norman Fairclough, it suggests that the world is constituted by both discourse and other social practices (Fairclough 2006, Winther Jørgensen and Phillips 1999). This differs from more radical analytical strategies, where discourse is regarded as wholly constitutive of the social (Butler 1990, Laclau and Mouffe 1985, Andersen 1999). Studies of communicative events take centre stage in critical discourse analysis, such as text, talk, images and other forms of representation. This provides a methodology that complies with the analytical requirements of the broader and more complicated ideas, agendas and practices related to governance today.

Inspired by this approach, we have made use of a variety of methodologies, i.e. our analysis is multi-dimensional. We have combined qualitative and quantitative methodologies of data analysis and collection and we have conducted observations as well as textual studies. We have combined language with other semiotic modalities, like visual images, gestures and sounds. In this manner, our methodology is characterised by a widening of analytical attention and tools in the representation of gender mainstreaming, such as:

- Discourses as ways of representing gender and diversity mainstreaming, e.g. in the shape of overall organisational or political discourse of women's organisations and the EU.
- Genres as ways of acting and interacting, e.g. in the extensive reports and conference speeches concerning the strategy of gender mainstreaming.
- Styles and material, bodily and visual expressions and voices, e.g. at conferences and in campaigns related to the strategy.

The general aim of feminist critical discourse analysis is to show the complex, subtle and often invisible ways in which canonical gendered assumptions and hegemonic power relations are discursively produced, sustained, negotiated and challenged in different contexts and communities (Lazar 2007, Dijk 2001/2004: 12). Hence feminist critical discourse analysis has been useful for dealing with universal and hegemonic ideas about gender and in addressing intersectional complexities. Furthermore, feminist critical discourse analysis has been able to challenge the subtle

forms of gendered asymmetries in late modern societies, and to critically address new forms of power and hierarchy (Lazar 2007: 141-142). As such feminist critical discourse analysis has an open political goal. According to scholars in the field, it forms part of an analytical activism that operates with the insight that text and talk (as with other representations) have material and phenomenological effects for groups of men and women, and ethnic and sexual minorities in specific contexts (Lazar 2007, Marling 2010).

Critical discourse analysis implies a broad approach which links the fields of cultural and social analysis that are often pursued separately. It also provides the opportunity to build connections between institutional analysis, and perceptions, values and cultural symbols. As such, critical discourse analysis invites one to bridge the rich body of feminist citizenship research, focused on the public and strategic sites of norms and practices, with the broader field of cultural analysis of representations, values and symbols that contribute to the making of mobilisations and public life (Trentman 2007). In this report we will use the approach of critical discourse analysis as an inspiration for exploring the different dimensions of discourses about gender and diversity mainstreaming in various ways and in relation to a range of themes. The report will develop and discuss three themes, which also served as guidelines for the empirical data collection outlined below:

- How is gender mainstreaming articulated by EU and governmental institutions and by women's NGOs?
- How is gender understood; and what are the practical implications of this understanding?
- How is gender mainstreaming linked with the call for intersectional analysis and diversity mainstreaming?

The report will enter upon different levels and contexts in the so-called velvet triangles between institutions, women's movements and gender research. In so doing, we discuss gender mainstreaming and how the notion has been perceived and changed by different agents, activists and experts. These examples and contexts can illuminate different approaches, understandings and ways of working with gender mainstreaming.² Yet, the report should not be understood as a comprehensive outline or as an exhaustive list of all actions, programmes etc. related to gender mainstreaming in the EU or in the EU member states. Rather it aims at getting around crucial matters and dilemmas produced in the practical implementation of gender mainstreaming by a selection of institutions and stakeholders. Consequently, the report outlines and makes an assessment of a range of crucial cases and practices that have defined and moved the strategy in different, or similar, directions over the last 15 years.

² The idea of velvet triangles was applied in Woodward (2003) and refers to gender equality as a soft policy area.

The data collection

As described above, the report is based on a variety of methods. A significant part of the data consists of a sampling and screening of expressions related to the Beijing + 15 process as a communicative event. This includes official and NGO reports issued from the EU countries and the European Women's Lobby (EWL). More concretely, the material consists in the following types, which have been applied for different purposes in this report:

- Reports submitted by the EU member states for the 15 years review of the Beijing Platform of Action to the UN DAW secretariat. At the European level, the contributions to the Beijing Process have mainly been coordinated in the framework of the UN Economic Council of Europe (UNECE). This process has taken the form of regional conferences followed by short regional reports aimed at the DAW report collection.³ Yet an effort was made by the Swedish Presidency with respect to the Beijing + 15 process, in the presentation of a comprehensive report that pinpointed the progress made, and identified the remaining obstacles and challenges in the EU. This report was made on the basis of information and consultations with the EU member states. It was "taken note of" by the EU Council in 2009 but the report was not submitted on behalf of the EU as such.⁴ We have made a screening of the EU level reports, which we have applied as a substantiation and complementation of the qualitative analysis.
- Extensive reports by the European Women's Lobby in response to the global evaluation processes have also been analysed. The EWL has provided extensive reports in response to the global evaluation processes. These reports are based on contributions and discussion with EWL members and other organisations. They follow a common structure, focused on: (1) Progress, action taken, good practice; (2) Barriers still existing: specifically, analysis of the situation of women in the area concerned, and in the later reports, their broader socio-economic contexts; (3) Conclusions and EWL recommendations.

Additionally, our empirical materials derive from data collection in a five European countries, selected examples of different gender regimes: Nordic (Norway), Continental (Germany, Austria), Southern Europe (Spain) and Eastern Europe (Poland) (Sümer 2009). This part of our empirical material consists of both a quantitative survey and qualitative interviews with key actors in governmental units, women's organizations and other relevant NGOs.

³ See review report for Europe: ECE/AC.28/2009/3 Regional review of progress: Regional synthesis.

⁴ However the EU has made parallel internal follow ups on the Beijing +15 process: In 1995 the Madrid European Council requested an annual review of the implementation in the Member States of the Beijing Platform for Action. And, since 1999, sets of quantitative and qualitative indicators have been developed by subsequent presidencies, but so far they only cover 9 of the 12 critical areas of concern in the Platform. In both the 10 and 15 year review of the Beijing Platform for Action, the EU ministers for gender equality adopted conclusions which supported and reaffirmed EU commitments to gender equality and the Beijing Platform for Action. See: Council Conclusions on the review of the implementation by the Member States and the EU institutions of the Beijing Platform for Action; Beijing + 15 Review Progress; 2980 Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council Meeting Brussels 30 November 2009.

Generally, the agents we interviewed were experts or persons with a certain power placed in public institutions or in NGOs, i.e. our interviews were expert or elite interviews. This type of interview is characterised by the fact that experts provide a conduit for our research, hence the result of each interview is largely based on the expert's definition of the situation studied (Kezar 2003: 397). The people we interviewed were often both personally passionate about gender equality and representatives of an organization. They were speaking on behalf of their organization; but also, they themselves were highly engaged in the field. Our choice of interviewing experts gave us a solid basis for further focused work, giving an insight into how these agents saw topics and challenges in our specific area of interest, i.e. they gave us factual knowledge together with their perspectives, both of the organization but also their own, in the concrete setting they were positioned in.

The representatives we interviewed were from ministries or departments for gender equality in Spain, Poland, and Germany. Because our aim was to include the tools of gender mainstreaming in our study, we chose to interview a member of an inter-ministerial working group on gender mainstreaming (more specifically, on gender budgeting) in Austria. Moreover, we interviewed representatives from women's movements in Spain, Poland, Germany and Austria. All in all, agents from the following national institutions and organizations were interviewed:

1. Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, Germany. Interview: May 2010.
2. GenderKompetenzZentrum, Germany. Written interview: October 2008.
3. Deutscher Frauenrat, Germany. Interview: September 2008.
4. Österreichischer Frauenring, Austria. Interview: September 2008.
5. Bundesministerium für Finanzen / Working Group on Equal Treatment in the Ministry of Finance, Austria. Interview: September 2008.
6. Departament ds. Kobiet, Rodziny i Przeciwdziałania Dyskryminacji, Poland. Interview: September 2008.
7. Foundation for Women's Issues - I am Woman / FORUM 50+, Poland. Interview: September 2008.
8. Secretaría General de Políticas de Igualdad, Ministerio de Igualdad, Spain. Interview: June 2008.
9. CELEM, Spain. Interview: June 2008.

All interviews followed a similar interview guide, with minor variations in questions regarding ministries and NGOs⁵. All were recorded and transcribed afterwards. The interviews took place in premises of the institutions and organisations of those interviewed, and were conducted in English. The language caused problems for some agents, especially in Spain and Poland, who found it difficult to express themselves in a fluent and nuanced manner, as they would in their mother tongue. This became a significant when transcribing the interviews. In Spain, communication problems lead us to transcribe the interviews in summary, as a condensation of meaning. This meant that we did not have the same possibilities to quote the interviewees from Spain as we did with agents from other countries.

Norway was included later in the project, therefore we did not conduct any qualitative interviews there. Nevertheless, we thought Norway to be relevant for the study because of their turn to a more diversity orientated focus in Norwegian workplace equality.⁶

Moreover, we interviewed national umbrella NGOs representing the European Women's Lobby in Austria, in Germany and in Spain. Our choice of umbrella NGO's representing EWL in each country was based on the presumption that they would possess a broad knowledge about the situation of gender mainstreaming in their own country as also in a European context. We also sought to qualify the intersectional perspectives by interviewing a range of relevant NGOs at national and European levels. In Poland we interviewed the coordinating NGO representing the European AGE Platform, combining age with women's issues. Furthermore, we interviewed representatives from the European organizations:⁷

1. AGE: European Older People's Platform
2. ENAR: European Network against Racism
3. EWL: the European Women's Lobby
4. ILGA Europe: International Lesbian, Gay, Bi and Transgender Association
5. DAW: the Division for the Advancement of Women.

At the EU level, the interviews focused both on organisational facts as well as strategic questions related to gender mainstreaming and the Beijing Process and to the emergent field of diversity related to the European Treaty provisions and the European Year of Equality for All. The interviews with EWL and DAW proved to be at the core of our research interest. They are therefore referenced to a greater extent than the other interviews, which mainly stand as background material for the report.

⁵ Examples of interview guides in Annex 3.

⁶ Even if Norway does not have the status of being an EU member state, we have included Norway because of the close cooperation with EU, especially in the field of gender policy (Sümer 2009: 5).

⁷ See Annex 5 for a complete list of interviewed organizations.

Additionally, the circulation principles of the EU employees presented a problem when following the implementation of gender mainstreaming policy and the eventual effects: during the period, central agents in the field were moved to other assignments etc. This highlights the greater continuity in women's movements, not least the European Women's Lobby, with individuals gaining more extensive experience and greater prospects for gender mainstreaming.

The qualitative part of the report was accompanied by quantitative data collected during summer 2008. The survey was based on an online questionnaire⁸, aimed at ministries or departments for gender equality, NGOs on gender issues and NGOs on other discrimination grounds such as handicap, age or ethnicity. All in all 108 institutions and organizations in 27 EU member states and Norway received the questionnaire.⁹ More specifically, questionnaires were sent to 28 public departments for gender equality. Out of these 17 replied. Moreover, the questionnaire was sent to 54 different gender orientated NGO's, i.e. 2 NGO's in each European country, of which 28 were non-gender NGO's. Out of these a total of 18 replied, 12 of which were gender orientated NGOs and 6 were non-gender orientated NGOs replied.

One could entertain several reasons why this large proportion of NGOs did not reply to the questionnaire. It might be that although they appear to be active on various lists, they have in fact been discontinued. They might have changed their contact email. They might simply not have the resources to answer the questionnaire; these are often relatively small associations with few employees/volunteers. Since the survey was conducted in English, comprehension could also be another obstacle to answering the questionnaire.

To increase the percentage of answers, several steps were taken:

- Regarding non-functional e-mail addresses, new e-mail addresses were identified.
- Contact through another e-mail address was tried several times.
- Lack of response was followed up with several reminders.
- Some governmental units failed to respond despite having signed for answers. They also received reminders.

The institutions and organisations are named in the report. However, besides Carolyn Hannan from DAW, individual identities of the persons we interviewed are anonymous.

Besides these interviews and text studies, observation in conferences and seminars on gender mainstreaming were made. Meetings with selected Danish stakeholders were also conducted.

⁸ Examples of questionnaires in Annex 4 and 5.

⁹ These totals for governmental and non-governmental institutions include the governmental departments and organisations, which later proved to be shut down, merged, or changed e-mail address.

Strategic documents collected during the quantitative and qualitative interviews also form part of the background material.¹⁰ These were collected by asking the people we interviewed about important and relevant documents concerning their specific policies and actions on gender mainstreaming and gender equality.

Because of both the relatively small percentage of respondents in the quantitative survey, and also because of our qualitative approach, we do not claim to present a generalised picture of gender mainstreaming in Europe. Our study shows issues as well as problems that characterise the processes and practice of gender mainstreaming in certain specific contexts. However, we believe that these findings say something relevant and important about the strategy of gender mainstreaming in practice.

¹⁰See list of collected reports, papers, documents, etc. in Annex 7

Chapter 1: Gender Mainstreaming and Multiple Inequalities. The Political Framework of the EU



As stated in the introduction, this report aims to explore and refine existing ideas and approaches to the study of gender mainstreaming. In this chapter, we shall briefly outline the political framework of gender mainstreaming and multiple inequalities in the EU. The guiding questions are these: How has gender mainstreaming and multiple inequality respectively been brought into the political agenda? How do these frameworks interfere with wider ideas of governance and citizenship in multicultural Europe?

Gender mainstreaming as a travelling and contested strategy

At the institutional level the notion of gender mainstreaming was endorsed in 1995 at the Fourth UN World Conference. In the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the global equality strategy of gender mainstreaming was launched and defined as follows:

“Mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the policies and programmes in all political, economic, and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.” (United Nation E 1997/L.30, adopted by ECOSOC 14.7.97)¹¹

The EU version of gender mainstreaming has prioritised and made explicit a double perspective, focusing on both the gender dimension and specific actions for women:

“This situation can be tackled efficiently by integrating the gender equality objective into the policies that have a direct or indirect impact on the lives of women and men. Women’s concerns, needs and aspirations should be taken into account and assume the same importance as men’s concerns in the design and implementation of policies.

In parallel to gender mainstreaming, persistent inequalities continue to require the implementation of specific actions in favour of women. The proposed framework strategy is based on this dual-track approach.”¹²

¹¹ Although the concept already appeared in the international texts from the UN Third World Conference on Women in Nairobi 1995 in relation to women in development, the notion of gender mainstreaming/integration first appeared in Europe in the beginning of the 1990s. It was mentioned in the European Commission’s Third Medium-term Community Programme on Equal opportunities for women and men (1991-1995), while the Nordic Council of Ministers had decided to take active steps to have gender equality aspects incorporated in all areas of policy and at all levels already in March 1995. See Council of Europe: *Gender Mainstreaming* (1998: 12-13).

¹² This approach was adopted by the Commission Communication of the 21st of February 1996 *Incorporating equal opportunities for women and men into all Community policies and activities*, COM (96) 67 final).

This dual focus on both gender and women came about after pressure from women's movements and other agents both within and outside the EU. The dual track of both gender-sensitive and women-specific provisions has been maintained in programmes and treaties ever since, where mainstreaming has been integrated into EU equality programmes and institutional arrangements at the EU Commission and Parliamentary levels. Gender mainstreaming has been advanced by committees and expert groups as well as in equality programmes and research.¹³

In general, the EU gender equality policies were both deepened and broadened during the 1990s as a result of global influences and pressure from European feminist communities. Also, the intrinsic need for enhancing EU legitimacy in gender issues played a role. In particular, Nordic women regarded the EU as a threat to the welfare state and their relatively high levels of gender equality. Feminist criticism of the EU at that time addressed the limited definition of rights as narrowly related to the market, leaving out questions related to women as sexual beings, such as questions of sexual abuse, violence against women, and abortion (Hansen 2000, Carsten Nielsen 2002, Walby 2004).

The EU curbed these reservations in ways that opened avenues for the implementation of gender mainstreaming. One way was in the pursuit of an inclusive and positive idea of European citizenship; another way was through the launching of new equality initiatives. Hence, during 1990s the EU equality agenda was extended in the provision of both hard and soft law measures and through a stronger institutional framework, of which gender mainstreaming was an integral part.¹⁴

Yet the most elaborate definition of gender mainstreaming in the EU framework was presented in a report on gender mainstreaming by the Council of Europe (1998).¹⁵ The report, issued by "*the group of Specialists on Mainstreaming*", outlined several of the basic implications of gender mainstreaming.

¹³ Institutional provisions in relation to the EU Commission include: *The inter-service group on gender Equality*, the unit *Equality between Men and Women*. The latter has several attached bodies: *The advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men*; and the (informal) *High Level Group on Gender mainstreaming*; besides the *European Parliament Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality*. The EU policies have been operationalized in *Road maps for Equality between Women and Men*, with priority areas that are closely linked to the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. The current one runs from 2006 to 2010 (Beijing + 15: 8- 13). The road map was followed in 2010 by the less comprehensive *EU strategy for equality between women and men (2010-2015)*, which will be dealt with later in this report. The *European Institute for Gender Equality* was opened in Vilnius in 2009 and the first announced tenders focused on the wider developments of indicators related to the Beijing Platform for Action, which we will return to in detail later.

¹⁴ Among the Directives of the 1990s that applied to gender equality note: Council Directive 1992 on the safety and health of pregnant workers and workers who have recently given birth (Directive 89/391/EEO); Council Directive 1996 on the framework agreement on parental leave; followed by Council Directive 2004 on the principles of equal treatment between men and women in the access to goods and services; and Directive 2006 on the implementation of the principles of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation. For a full list see European Commission. Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities Unit G2: *EU rules on Gender Equality. How are they transposed into National Law?* 2009.

¹⁵ The Council of Europe was established in 1949 and has a particular emphasis on legal standards, human rights, democratic development, the rule of law and cultural co-operation. It has 47 member states with some 800 million citizens. It is distinct from the European Union (EU) which has common policies, binding laws and only twenty-seven members. The Council played a central role in the development of new standards for co-operation between East and Western Europe in the Post-Soviet Era after 1989.

Gender mainstreaming was here presented as *“the (re)organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated in all policies at all levels and at all stages, by the actors normally involved in policy-making”* (Council of Europe: 15).

Furthermore, a basic conceptual framework and set of methodologies were outlined, with emphasis on the multiple implications of gender mainstreaming. The definitions, which later fed into different political strategies and academic discussions, can briefly be summarized as follows:

- *First* that gender mainstreaming implies the mainstream integration of both gender equality as a perspective and gender equality as a goal.
- *Second* the definition points to gender mainstreaming as both a political and a technical process. It involves new ways of devising and approaching policies and shifts in organisational or in institutional culture, leading to changes in societal structures. Gender mainstreaming involves the reorganisation of policy processes because it moves the attention of gender equality policies to everyday policies, and to the activities of the agents ordinarily involved in the policy processes at stake (Council of Europe: 14).
- *Third* the reorganisation, improvement and development of policy processes implies the need for various techniques and tools. It includes the full participation of women in all aspects of life as well as the analysis of all proposals concerning general or sectoral politics and programmes from a gender equality perspective. It is important that the definition leaves room for all these tools and techniques to be taken into consideration. Moreover, the availability of, and the need for various actors and techniques can vary from one context another and the definition should therefore not be finite (Council of Europe: 14).

The definition and goals of gender mainstreaming at this programmatic level seemed to be open and flexible both in terms of content, methodology and possible agency. Yet it might be indicative, for future developments and for the technocratic understanding of gender mainstreaming in the EU, that the report was produced by “specialists” and not on the basis of deliberative processes or by a mixed group of both specialists and movement representatives.

From the perspective of 2010, now that gender mainstreaming and the Beijing process have been reviewed in the so-called Beijing + 15 process, it seems as if the results have been very mixed. The review made at EU level revealed that the great promises of gender mainstreaming have not been fulfilled; mainstreaming has not been implemented systematically in the broad range of thematic areas launched in the Beijing Platform for Action. Nor has gender mainstreaming been implemented even in the stronghold areas of gender equality policies such as employment, social inclusion and structural

funds; nor has it been implemented as a principle in all stages of planning and decision-making (Beijing + 15. The Platform for Action and the European Union (2009)).¹⁶

These conclusions converge with the general claim, that gender mainstreaming has been successfully implemented at the treaty levels and held as a useful guideline, but that the notion has been difficult to institutionalise in organizational practices and as part of political procedures. This has been substantiated in a range of studies focused on how gender mainstreaming has been implemented in particular fields of EU policies (such as family and equality, employment) as well as in major European institutions and strategies (e.g., European Court of Justice) and in the workings of the EU Commission procedures and policies (Lombardo and Meier 2006, Shaw 2002, Stratigaki 2005, Woodward 2001/2008). The studies, many of which have been commissioned by the EU, confront the theoretical potential of gender mainstreaming with unstable and inadequate implementation. From different perspectives and with different emphases they have criticized the understandings and tools associated with gender mainstreaming as an equality strategy.

Several scholars and policy makers agree that whilst the EU gender mainstreaming strategy is on track, change to date is rather limited and the implementation process has been uneven (Beijing + 15 2009 + statements). Progress has been too piecemeal, and gender mainstreaming is mostly practised as isolated measures. Gender mainstreaming needs to be consolidated and further developed; areas that have thus far remained untouched need to be encompassed. But when it comes to long term strategies, opinions differ between policy makers/practitioners and feminist scholars. While the EU review makes a call for a more systematic approach, in the shape of gender impact assessments, gender sensitive statistics, and a call for new indicators to measure progress and training programmes to develop gender expertise (EU Beijing + 15: 24)¹⁷. Yet feminist researchers from various perspectives have urged for a broader, more inclusive approach to gender mainstreaming: one that will clear the way for intersectional politics; diversity; and more inclusive policy processes. Both aspects will be elaborated upon in the following chapters.

The politics of Multiple Inequalities in the EU

Along with the focus on gender, the EU has addressed multiple inequalities and discrimination on a range of additional grounds.¹⁸ Over recent decades old European ideas of diversity and the slogan of *unity in diversity* have been entwined with global discourse on human rights and ideas of multiple discrimination. Presently, these strategies form an important part of the EUs approach to core

¹⁶ The report was not issued by the EU as such, but the conclusions were consulted with the EU member states.

¹⁷ This assignment has been turned over to the European Institute for Gender Equality, opened in 2010, which has a strong focus on qualifying the Beijing Platform and on Gender Mainstreaming at European level.

¹⁸ The idea of multiple discrimination was introduced at the UN world conference against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia etc. in Durban, South Africa in 1991.

challenges and goals, such as immigration, social inclusion, integration and employment (Equality and non discrimination in an enlarged European Union. Green paper, 2004).¹⁹

The aim of combating discrimination on multiple grounds gained momentum in Europe during the 1990s. Hence, Article 13 of the Amsterdam Treaty brought about a wider anti-discrimination provision, including discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age and sexual orientation. In the new Lisbon Treaty, carried in the autumn of 2009, this broad anti-discrimination agenda was staged high in the common provisions, notably in Articles 2 and 6 in which minorities are even mentioned prior to gender (Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union/The Lisbon Treaty, 2008).²⁰ The broad equality agenda has been implemented at national levels in different ways, and has initiated institutional reforms with different equality bodies and resource centres, merging into a multi dimensional structure (Hegnhøj 2008).

Article 2 of the Lisbon Treaty reads: “The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail”.

Article 3,3 is quoted as saying that: “It shall combat social exclusion and discrimination, and shall promote social justice and protection, equality between women and men, solidarity between generations and protections of the rights of the child.”

Article 6 explicitly refers to the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (of December 7, 2000; adapted in Strasbourg on December 12, 2007) as having the same legal value as Treaties. The main motivation of the Charter was to combat racial discrimination (paragraph 21, while gender is mentioned in paragraph 23 in line with a range of categories which explicate the different dimensions of discrimination).

All in all, Europe has prioritised the issues of mainstreaming both gender and diversity. Thus in 2005 the European Union presented itself as the laboratory of the world in terms of implementation of the gender mainstreaming strategy in the whole region. And in relation to multiple discrimination, it has been described as the “most progressive human rights regime in the world” (*Framework Strategy on Gender Equality – Work Programme for 2005 SEC*, 2005,1044; *Commission of the European Communities and Donnelly*, 2003: 138; Artemjeff & Henriksson (2006: 18-32)).

¹⁹ Among the provisions are: *EU Charter of Fundamental Rights*, 2000, Article 21. Besides this, a community action plan to combat discrimination (2001-2006) was launched. It was allocated nearly 100 million Euros (98.4 million Euros), which compares to the budget of the Road Maps for Equality between Women and Men with a budget of 10 million p.a.

²⁰ The Treaty was launched in 2007 and acceded by all members in November 2009.

Beneath the polished surface, however, several problems and challenges have been indicated. The EU's broad equality strategy, as expressed at many community levels, has been criticised for assuming unquestioned similarity of inequalities – a *one size fits all* approach (Verloo 2006). Meaning that different actions and regulations have lacked in consistency, and further, that different inequalities get different levels of protection and policy attention. An adequate approach needs to address the issues at deeper analytical levels. It also needs to reflect the different histories and dynamics of inequalities as well as the political dimensions, such as the role of the private and public sphere, not least the role of the state in reproducing and changing inequalities (EWL Report 2004 and Verloo 2006: 211-228). The data collection of this report demonstrates that the equality units at governmental levels have appreciated the inclusion of more dimensions than the NGOs and women's movements.²¹ In the following we shall briefly introduce the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All as an exchange point and illustration of the challenges of linking gender mainstreaming with other areas of discrimination.

The European Year of Equal Opportunities for all

The European Year of Equal Opportunities was launched in 2007 as part of a typically EU returning event, aimed at sharpening attitudes and educating European publics in EU values and ideas.

Moreover, the European year can be seen as part of the elaborated means employed by the EU to address European populations. These include the use of sophisticated skills to target focal audiences, so-called "discourse shapers", such as journalists, NGOs and academics (Michalski 2005: 138). Since their inception in 1983, the European years have been dealing with shifting themes, addressing the ambitions of Europeanization and values, and often related to citizenship and rights.²²

The European Year of Equal Opportunities for all was launched primarily as a political substantiation of Article 13 in the Amsterdam Treaty and as a laboratory case for dealing with the six grounds of discrimination: sex; racial or ethnic origin; religion or belief; disability; age; and sexual orientation. All of these were to be contained and bridged within one and the same initiative. The broad objectives of the EU Commission were spelled out in an optimistic tune, where the negative term "discrimination" was substituted by the more positive "equal opportunities", with the following motivation: "*Rather than confining itself to eliminating discrimination, an equal opportunities policy also has to try to provide all individuals with opportunities for becoming fully involved on the same footing in society*" (Celebrating

²¹ The material – quantitative and qualitative – will be elaborated in relation to the case studies of this Gender Mainstreaming Report.

²² Recent European Year themes: 2005 – Citizenship through Education; 2006 – Workers Mobility; 2007 – Equal Opportunities for All; 2008 – Intercultural Dialogue; 2009 – Creativity and Innovation; 2010 – Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion. The EWL has lobbied for a year on gender related violence, which has not been in focus since 1999 – Action to Combat Violence for Women.

2007).²³ Moreover the year was branded as “*Let’s make equality a reality – together we can make a difference*”, a dynamic and optimistic slogan that included contemporary EU words and visions.

The overall aims were elaborated under four key areas of attention, i.e. the four Rs: *Rights, Representation, Recognition* and *Respect* – each of which should be related to the six categories of discrimination (The 2007 Eurorean Year of Equal Opportunities for All. Final Report 2008: 11). Here the attention was directed to an idea of equality “*that does not mean sameness*”. And it was argued that implementation of the equality principles ought to take into account differences and diversity, so as to ensure that each individual enjoyed equal treatment (Best of 2007: 4). An important aim for enhanced recognition was to “*involve the general public in an open ended debate on the meaning of diversity in contemporary Europe and ways of valuing difference in society.*” It is striking that these four Rs echo the tools that had already been used in gender mainstreaming practices, except for the surprising exclusion of resources listed in gender mainstreaming strategies as a demand and precondition for successful interventions (Rees 2005). This underlines the soft agenda of the entire activity, which focused mostly on (individual) behaviour, consciousness raising and change of values, and not on hard measures and resource allocation.

Besides, the 2007 European Year was dealing with equality as “a multifaceted concept”, and both multiple discrimination and gender mainstreaming were intended as cross cutting issues that should be reflected in all activities. Hence, gender was set in a double position: both as a discrimination ground and as a cross cutting dimension related to the entire programme (The 2007 Eurorean Year of Equal Opportunities for All. Final Report 2008: 12). It is indicative of the unsettled relations between gender mainstreaming and multiple discrimination that they were listed as parallel and not as intersectional issues (The 2007 Eurorean Year of Equal Opportunities for All. Final Report 2008: 7). The lack of clarification of each term, and their interrelatedness, became particularly crucial with respect to gender.²⁴ Of the four reports of the 2007 European Year, the gender mainstreaming report was far the most critical. It showed that, though the concept of gender mainstreaming was generally well defined in the planning documents of the EU, further guidelines and examples concerning how to implement gender mainstreaming in practice was lacking (The 2007 European year of Equal Opportunities for All European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Thematic Report on Gender Mainstreaming 2008: 7). This criticism was underlined by the European Women’s Lobby:

“However, while gender equality was included in the themes of the Year, the focus and visibility given to women’s rights was insufficient. The Evaluation report focusing specifically on the implementation of

²³ Celebrating 2007: Best of 2007, European Year of Equal Opportunities for All, National Campaign Highlights: www.equality2007.europa.eu

²⁴ For further theoretical challenges see Verloo 2006.

gender mainstreaming shows the lack of knowledge of the member states regarding the concept itself; they often interpreted gender mainstreaming to mean simply having many women and men on a meeting panel.” (EWL Beijing + 15: 91)

The EWL's position on the Year was critical towards the entire set up, but specifically of the way in which gender had been included. They argued that gender mainstreaming had been insufficiently understood and translated into gender equality, whilst the remaining and more demanding part of gender mainstreaming (i.e., the gender dimension) was lacking in most activities. Hence the wider gender dimension, seen as a vital part of gender mainstreaming, was lost in this experiment, whereas the broad equality agenda was dealt with by many stakeholders.²⁵

It is striking that the EU Commissioner responsible for gender equality reviewed the Year in a more optimistic tune, seeing the agenda of equal opportunities for all as a tool that would eventually erase structural inequalities:

“In Europe today we must stamp out discrimination so as to reap the benefits of diversity and develop a more competitive and dynamic economy and society.

By promoting equal opportunities for all, we can tackle the structural barriers faced by many migrants, ethnic minorities, the disabled, older and younger workers and other vulnerable groups.” (Equality and non-discrimination 2006: 2)

While the short term effects of the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All have been extensively evaluated, the considerable efforts and resources dedicated have been impeded by a lack of long term follow up activities. It has not been clear at all who the responsible parties for continuing the activities were, and still are. From both political and analytical perspectives there is an urgent need for more independent assessments and follow up activities, in order to not to waste all the time and effort spent. At the EU level, it is thought provoking that the different equality dimensions are now catered for by the Directorate for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, opened in 2010. At the same time, gender and ethnicity are dealt with in specialized institutions such as the Agency for Fundamental Rights and the European Gender Institute. It seems as if the EU processes in the field of Equal Opportunities for All have stopped half way, and that further developments need the provisions of well funded NGO frameworks and development, as well as new and crosscutting institutional tools.

²⁵ The evaluations were based on interviews with key stake holders and not on in-dept analysis of the communicative outcomes.

Gender mainstreaming and soft governance in the EU

The EU as a political experiment in the making has been assessed as an effective frame for the use of feminist advocacy both inside and outside established institutions. This is a situation that has also been gainful to the central staging of gender mainstreaming (Pollack and Hafner-Burton 2004, Ferree 2006). As such, the promotion of gender equality and gender mainstreaming could be seen as part of the new and relocated architecture of state and governance, where central aims are channelled through so-called soft governance. Soft governance, in line with the work of gender mainstreaming, applies indirect policy instruments such as soft laws and recommendations, as well as joint standards, codes of conduct and stakeholder involvement (Jordana and Faur 2004, Majone 1994). Here gender mainstreaming can be seen as part of a new architecture that even includes a relocation of former divisions of domestic and foreign policies into new and more open dynamics (True and Mintron 2001: 28). These new dynamics connect to the more encompassing processes of Europeanization and identity formation, and to new elaborations of citizenship. Furthermore, they address both formal political and legal rights, as well as individual identity and belonging.

At the same time the EU campaigns and soft values can easily be applied in a counter-productive manner, creating boundaries and set-backs for equality discourses. For example, in current European gender equality discourses, these have been turned around and are widely used by right wing and populist communities as means to uphold Western hegemonies and racism. This perspective has been coined as the European Citizenship paradox, in which racism and inequality (intended to be combated by the EU) has been enhanced by cultural anxiety produced by the introduction and campaigns for new EU standards and norms (Strasser 2010: 7).

Chapter 2: Conceptual Discourses and Models of Gender Mainstreaming



The Beijing Platform for Action stated that gender mainstreaming was to be carried out as an all-encompassing 'holistic' strategy aimed at enhancing gender equality and justice. At the conceptual level, gender mainstreaming grants significance to gender as a central determinant of thought and action and recognises its role in power relations and institutions. Gender mainstreaming assumes that women and men are differentially affected by politics and seeks to advance gender equality by revising all mainstream policy areas. This implies that all policies should be analysed *ex ante* for their gendered impact, so that they can benefit men and women equally and so that the knowledge acquired can be integrated into all dimensions of decision-making (Rees 2002, Hankivsky 2005).

From a conceptual angle, gender mainstreaming confronts and relocates some of the key notions and outlooks of earlier equality strategies of the 20th century (Brade et al 2004, Verloo 2005):

- Gender mainstreaming relocates the earlier focus on women as a group to focus on gender and intersections with other (identity) categories such as ethnicity, sexuality, religion etc.
- Gender mainstreaming relocates the earlier focus on justice to a focus on resource management and flexibility.
- Gender mainstreaming focuses on and implies consensus and resources rather than conflict and barriers.
- Gender mainstreaming relocates gender equality from a "ghetto" position into the mainstream.

This relocation and blurring of perspectives has confronted women's movements and institutional agents with new possibilities and challenges. So far gender mainstreaming has been assessed in a range of studies that operate with contrasting pairs of practices and prospects: transformation versus assimilation (Rees 1998), agenda setting versus integration (Lombardo 2005) or frame bridging versus frame extension (Verloo and Lombardo 2007).

In the following, we have sought to settle notions of gender mainstreaming from perspectives that go beyond the either/or dichotomies. We have tried to link practices to differentiated ideas of institutional practice, and to wider ideas of democracy and mobilisations. Accordingly we have made our analysis in the framework of two models. They can briefly be outlined as follows:

1. An expert or bureaucratic model of mainstreaming that refers to the revision of existing policymaking (as outlined above). This refers to the turn of existing policymaking such that equality and non-discrimination perspectives are taken into account in all stages of policymaking, in addition to a long-standing institutionalised commitment to the promotion of equality, implemented by public officials and experts. The focus in this model is on organisational change, on the use of experts and the importance of strategy-building. This

implies that gender should be incorporated into all policies at all levels and stages by actors normally involved in policymaking. It also implies that gender equality (and eventually other transversal dimensions) should be integrated into the routine operations and core functions of any given organisation.

2. A participatory-democratic model of gender mainstreaming that requires equal participation of women's and other groups in society in political and public life. Hence also the promotion of networking, dialogue, social mobilisation and the involvement of NGOs in all stages of policymaking. In the participatory sense, gender mainstreaming can be seen as part of a new governance process, notably in the EU, that has been open for new agendas and areas of policymaking in the field. This model calls for the building of alliances between civil servants, politicians, academics, women's and other social movements, and the media, in order to address new and old areas of discrimination and for the promotion of inclusion and justice. In this model it is crucial to include and empower social movements and civil society into political processes.

The two models also accentuate the tension involved in gender mainstreaming definitions and visions among different agents. Is gender mainstreaming primarily a provision of a comprehensive set of tool kits carried out by normal policy agents and civil servants? Or is gender mainstreaming primarily a political process, in which women's participation and gender issues are mobilised and guaranteed a voice in policymaking? These are vital questions, to which we will return in the following chapters. One of the insights we will reach is that both institutional and mobilizing strategies need to be advanced in order to realise the potential of the visions introduced in the Beijing Platform for Action.²⁶

Gender mainstreaming as a mobilising and participatory tool

The focus of this report is on the interface of ideas, policies and practices of gender mainstreaming. It departs from questions such as: how is the collective agency and mobilisation of women tied to the notions and practices of gender mainstreaming? Gender mainstreaming has (in the most optimistic assessments) been regarded as a result of new governance processes and exchanges between women's NGOs and transnational and regional bodies like the UN and the EU. Gender mainstreaming, in this horizon, has been launched as a radical and holistic strategy to obtain gender equality, as a strategy capable of involving state machineries, NGOs, researchers and civil society in order to address and advance gender-fair policies. Moreover, gender mainstreaming has been staged as a strategy that

²⁶ The lack of new or intersectional perspectives was confirmed at the Beijing + 15 Regional Review Meeting, Geneva 2-3, 2009, convened by the Economic Commission for Europe. However, this is with the exception of certain Eastern/non-EU member states, who underlined the very different gender structures present in their societies. For instance, the idea of gender equality as "gender balance" does not make sense in their context, due to the fact that many men are worse off than women.

could be translated and framed into flexible practices at local, regional and multiple institutional levels. As such, gender mainstreaming has been regarded as thematically all-encompassing and at the same time as a strategy where the former pitfalls and universal claims of global (liberal) feminism could be avoided.

In the following, we will seek to advance this question through the lenses of scholars who focus on the critical question of the mobilising and transformative potentials of gender mainstreaming from a theoretical and strategic angle. Among them are the political scientist Judith Squires and the sociologists Mieke Verloo and Olena Hankivsky. Each has endeavoured to widen the scope of gender mainstreaming and to critically associate gender mainstreaming with democracy and civil mobilisations, rather than with bureaucratic, institutional and expert strategies. Accordingly, it is vital to focus on the relations between concepts and how they are represented in feminist strategies. Further questions concern the effects of certain representations and how subjects are constituted within them, such as: What are the prospects of change and who is likely to benefit from the particular representations?

Accordingly, we have chosen to explore feminist approaches that address visionary and mobilising models of gender mainstreaming and to include scholars who claim that gender cannot be considered in isolation from diversity (Squires 2005, Verloo 2005, Hankivsky 2005). While Verloo has critically deconstructed the EU staging of gender mainstreaming and the potentials of intersectional politics, Judith Squires has suggested (more constructively) that gender mainstreaming should be transformed from a technocratic tool into an “institutional manifestation of deliberate democracy” able to contain more axes of discrimination (Squires 2005). In relation to the FEMCIT project, notably the analytical focus on the role of the women’s movements, it is apposite to interrogate gender mainstreaming as a mobilising tool and as a possible paradigm shift for thinking about gender and other kinds of equality in policy- processes.

We will depart from Squires’ work, which provides the most encompassing attempt to locate the different versions of gender mainstreaming in the context of an established three-fold typology of feminist strategies in the 20th century. The typology, well-known in feminist scholarship, has been used both in the location of feminist theoretical developments and feminist strategies, as well as in the discussion of citizenship (Scott 1986, Squires 1999, Booth and Bennett 2002, Prins 2006). Hence, Squires weaves her earlier theoretical work on gender in political theory into the current practices of gender mainstreaming. Yet Squires elaborates the well-known conceptual discourses of equality in the framework of inclusion, reversal and displacement notions (Squires 1999).²⁷

²⁷ Squires’ work is based on Anglo-American and Nordic political discourses. For similar approaches to mainline genealogies in the assessment of feminist strategies, see Scott 1986, Rees 2002, and Prins 2006.

The first typology, the strategy of inclusion, is built on objectivity and the understanding of humans as (genderless) individuals and has both historically and currently been linked with liberal convictions. The corresponding vision of equality politics is gender neutrality, and the accomplishments of formal equality, equality *de jure*, demands for equality in law.

According to Squires, one can talk about mainstreaming of equal opportunities along these lines in order to obtain formal equality. During the equal treatment policies of the 1970s, the strategy was labelled as 'tinkering', indicating inclusion and legal redress such that men and women would be treated in the same manner. This framework is currently expressed in the aim for integration and equal treatment. Here gender mainstreaming tends to be translated into the new market orientated framework and its accompanying neo-liberal rhetoric of economic competitiveness, which in the next turn results in a sole focus on individual careers and inclusion.

The second typology, known as the reversal strategy, derives from an interpretative methodology that focuses on "woman or women" based on common identity and exposed as a politics of difference. It has been labelled as radical or cultural feminism; along with 2nd wave feminism it translated into the strategy of positive action. In the 1980s, it was labelled as a tailoring strategy, when specific measures were introduced to redress disadvantages and thus recognise gender differences. In this version, gender mainstreaming implies the proliferation and integration of gendered (particularly women's) perspectives and voices in mainstream policies.²⁸

In political practice gender mainstreaming, combined with the strategy of reversal and positive action, has been conflated with similar claims made with respect to other groups. This has resulted in consultations with competing and conflicting identity groups, each of whose cause is negated/negotiated around the hierarchies of oppression; in particular, this is illustrated in the current tensions between feminism and multiculturalism (Okin 1999, Verloo 2006). According to Squires and others this version of gender mainstreaming is doomed to fail. For it leads to fragmentation and erosion of the general public virtues and reduces the imperative or incentive to speak across groups.

The third typology, displacement, draws explicitly on theoretical insights and feminist methodology. It implies the use of subject positions instead of identity and the application of gender as a verb rather than as a noun. It is open to the exposition of more adequate strategies in the form of diversity politics and of theoretical/poststructuralist deconstructions of discursive regimes that engender subjects. Gender mainstreaming in the context of displacement implies transformation of existing ways of knowing and redressing of gender and other inequalities. This version of gender mainstreaming is

²⁸ It should be noted, however, that the difference arguments have a long history in feminist thinking and have been associated with both conservative and radical feminist convictions.

more adequate and radical in addressing the broader institutional practices that cause individual and group disadvantages and aims at changing them.

(Gender) mainstreaming in this last and most radical version is a system approach. It contains, according to Squires, highly transformative potential because it operates beyond earlier notions and ideals: of equality and difference; of equality of opportunity and equality of outcome; and the recognition of cross-cutting diversity, which was lacking in previous equality strategies. To limit mainstreaming to narrow ideas of gender equality, Squires claims, is conceptually flawed given the diversities among men and women and other inequalities (Squires 2005: 379). Squires here suggests an entanglement of gender approaches, in what she calls a deliberate form of transformative mainstreaming that stresses the importance of dialogue with diverse social groups. Sites of deliberate innovations could be citizen's juries, consensus conferences, deliberative opinion polls and deliberate mapping.

At the same time, Squires suggests that the outlined approaches and practices of gender mainstreaming are complimentary rather than competing. In complex ways the different versions of gender mainstreaming are addressing, containing and contesting both old and new genealogies of feminist strategies. One can talk about analytical differences, but in practice at the political level, the different strategies often co-exist. In that sense the multiple expressions of gender mainstreaming allow for both improvements of previous approaches as well as for the addressing and elaboration of new and more encompassing themes and strategies. Booth and Bennett has transposed this inclusive notion of gender mainstreaming into the model of the so-called Three Legged Stool; they argue that gender mainstreaming needs to incorporate all three perspectives: "*Mainstreaming is a transformative strategy, (...) which draws on the equal treatment perspective, the women's perspective and the gender perspective and their respective delivery approaches*" (Booth and Bennett 2002: 430).

In Squires' horizon, both gender mainstreaming and deliberate democracy are dependent on an active civil society and the reinvigoration of the public spheres. Moreover, both strategies have to consider how deliberations within civil society are being transmitted to the formal arena of political decision-making.

We find Squires' suggestions innovative and valuable for our study, as it deals with connections between state policy/gender equality and civil society as embodied in women's movements. In other words, Squires' recommendation of greater focus on the innovative effects of gender mainstreaming in relation to civil society and new democratic procedures is sound. At the same time the mobilising model implies a more pro-active and public approach, aimed at new interventions. The question is whether this can be accomplished without the parallel developments and consolidations of bureaucratic and consultative models, in which Squires is less interested. In other words, what is the role left for institutions and bureaucracies in this model?

A further lack of clarification relates to the use of concepts. There seem to be missing links or unexplored sites in her argument, where gender somehow un-reflected disappears from the perspective, or is even substituted with an unclear notion of diversity which itself remains unelaborated. Particularly, in the transformative model it is unclear whether Squires is talking about gender-sensitive deliberate politics as gender mainstreaming *per se*, or about deliberate politics as in need of gender mainstreaming, or (eventually) diversity mainstreaming?

This criticism is echoed in the work of Mieke Verloo and Nancy Fraser, each of whom has refined the ideas of deliberation and power. Deliberation, Verloo argues, tends to favour the most powerful hegemonic movements and organisations; it is not typically open to diverse, marginal, critical movements and voices. In that sense, deliberation does not allow for criticism and contestations as such. Instead, one could argue for the introduction of a critical model of deliberation, which could guarantee the inclusion of marginal and even critical voices: for example, quoting Nancy Fraser, in the provision of “space for subaltern and non-hegemonic counter-publics” (Verloo 2005, Fraser 1997: 348). Such a critical idea of counter publics also offers a perspective on the agents and struggles involved in the politics of implementing gender mainstreaming, which we will return to in chapter 5.

Besides this, Verloo elaborates the idea of transformative strategies and change. She provides a precise statement of the ideas of displacement and empowerment as feminist political strategies in practice, suggesting a transformative model of gender mainstreaming that contains both *transformative* and *empowering* strategies. To be transformative, she says, “*gender mainstreaming should then be not only a strategy of displacement, but also a strategy of empowerment by organizing space for non-hegemonic actors to struggle about the (promotion of the) agenda of gender equality*” (Verloo 2005: 348). By contrast, it seems as if Squires operates with an implicative idea of transformation, i.e. transformative models of gender mainstreaming automatically imply empowerment of groups that take part in deliberate processes.

If one translates these ideas into the institutional frameworks of the EU, it is clear that ideas of deliberate democracy and more inclusive models of participatory democracy converge with the dominant frames of EU policy processes, e.g. in new modes of governance, which have allowed for more intense lobbying. This has also opened the EU for advocacy networks in the field of gender equality, which have made successful interventions in EU policymaking by means of knowledge transfers and advanced networking, e.g. in the field of gender related violence (Pollock and Hafner-Burton 2000). At the same time, such new forms of policymaking easily produce new paradoxes and social exclusion, as indicated above. The social composition of the new kind of policymakers, the trans-advocacy networks, tends to be the citizens/women who are already empowered, i.e. white or black middle-class women, while the voices and horizons of the less empowered and resourceful are still

excluded (Agustin 2008, Desai 2006).²⁹ This trend has also been evidenced throughout the FEMCIT project, notably the restricted access of minority women's organisations and networks in EU and global policy making (Femcit WP 4 report 2010). All in all, this invites a call for more thorough empirical investigations of processes of inclusion and exclusion in the emergent new solidarities and coalitions of social movements in Europe and at transnational levels.

In the following chapters, we will critically explore Squires' two-pronged model in relation to institutional and women's movement discourses. For example, chapter 3 explores and identifies different approaches to gender mainstreaming in relation to the dimensions within the two models, and against this background it discusses the implications and outcomes of these approaches to gender mainstreaming. However, we also question whether the two prongs of the model should be understood as quite so separated in the sense presented above.

Departing from the Beijing conference and the Beijing + 15 events at the level of the United Nations, we shall look at the strategy and contribution of the European Women's Lobby towards gender mainstreaming and the Beijing platform. Does the EWL qualify as an organization of deliberation in Squires' sense? And how does the EWL fare as a powerful European organisation in European equality politics? How does it fare in relation to the mobilisations of space for subaltern and non-hegemonic counter-publics? (Verloo 2005) How have tensions between bureaucratic and mobilising strategies in gender mainstreaming been negotiated by the EWL? Did EWL interventions widen and relocate the idea of gender mainstreaming and the space for feminist pressure and transformations?

Intersectionality and gender mainstreaming

Some scholars have made the connection between gender mainstreaming and intersectionality explicit and argued that an extended or relocated idea of gender mainstreaming could be seen as a response to the longstanding theoretical concerns of intersectionality. Accordingly, and as outlined above, gender mainstreaming should be replaced by new and more open forms of diversity and equality mainstreaming as well as new and more dynamic models of democracy (Squires 2005, Hankivsky 2005, Verloo 2006). Intersectionality could qualify the transformative idea of gender mainstreaming and the conceptualisation of the specific power dynamics involved in different kinds of inequalities.

Intersectionality implies analytical focus on different asymmetries of power based on gender, sexuality, ethnicity, class, age and nationality etc. One way of visualising intersectionality has been the image of a crossroads. This provides a model for showing how differences intersect; for example, within a particular person's identity or in a specific social practice or location, in social structures and

²⁹ See also Beveridge and Velluti (2008), who deal with how new governance structures present different problems and challenges in old and new EU member states.

cultural discourses. (Crenshaw 2006, Davis 2008).³⁰ In their reflections, Dorte Marie Søndergaard and Dorthe Staunæs, well-known Danish scholars in the field, argue for what they call a situated theoretical adjustment of intersectionality. They criticise the central visualisation of intersectionality as a crossroads metaphor which locks the imaginary and prevents change. They argue that the crossroads image makes it difficult to assess the production of hierarchy and power, or what becomes highways and byways. Do intersections take place between already fixed categories – or do intersections produce new categories? Or both? Søndergaard and Staunæs operate with an experimental and fluid approach of intersectionality and with categories labelled as “messy spaces of becoming”, which are convenient for social psychological processes of meaning-making at local levels. However, at the structural level, where gender mainstreaming operates, a both-and approach be more fruitful to maintain and recognise some of the powerful categories that are around as still very productive in the production and reproduction of power.

This approach has been spelled out by Leslie McCall. She defines three methodological complexities to intersectional analysis; these are related to ontology, epistemology, and the (pre)understandings and constructed nature of intersectional categories. Accordingly, she operates with 1) Anti-categorical complexity, 2) Intra-categorical complexity, and 3) Inter-categorical complexity. McCall is in favour of the categorical approach as a middle-range approach because it critically interrogates the boundary-making and boundary-defining processes that construct categories. At the same time, however, it is recognised that social categories represent “stable and durable relationships” (McCall 2005, Phoenix 2006: 27). When applied to our analysis of gender mainstreaming this implies an approach that operates with given categories, such as men and women, class, citizenship etc., but which is simultaneously open for new and different meanings and representations of the same concepts. This also links with the methodological framework of critical discourse analysis presented earlier.

Another central question and perplexity has been which categories and intersections should be analysed and when. As noted above, the EU has been a forerunner at the political level in the addition of categories of inequalities in its anti-discriminatory projects, which after some pressure have been followed up by EU-funded research. But it is important to recognise the historical and contingent nature of categories. Some categories surface and gain importance at certain historical moments, and not all categories carry the same weight at all times (Yuval-Davis 2006 b). This entails that scholars have to make strategic and creative priorities regarding the most relevant intersections for groups or individuals in the particular context.

³⁰ Intersectionality has been transposed from the US into European contexts in two different approaches. One along the lines of critical intersectional analysis focused on (known) structures and hegemonic discourses and a slightly different psychological intersectional approach focused on the meaning-making and strategic use of available discourses among/between individuals and groups. See *Kvinder, Køn og Forskning* (2006), for further elaborations of intersectionality as a travelling concept and its application in a Nordic context. See also thematic issues of *Kvinnovetenskapligt Tidsskrift* (2003) and *European Journal of Women's Studies* (2005).

How can such approaches be related to the search for a more adequate mode of gender mainstreaming? Hankivsky suggests a diversity mainstreaming framework. This would transcend the current focus and forms of gender mainstreaming into a more fluid and open form of mainstreaming, where gender is kept in mind, but not a priori placed as the most vital category. The approach can be summarised in the following points (Hankivsky 2005):

- Diversity mainstreaming includes a qualified defence of gender. Simultaneously, it challenges traditional conceptualisations, displacing gender as the primary axis for understanding experiences of discrimination, inequality and oppression.
- Diversity mainstreaming implies that the privileging of gender is replaced with a more sophisticated and comprehensive approach to understanding lived experience. This holds especially for those who have been and continue to be marginalised by current perspectives and practices of gender mainstreaming.
- Diversity mainstreaming places the importance of intersectionalities front and centre in the analysis. It suggests equivalences between oppressions that allow us to explore the links between the systems. Moreover, the battles of whose oppression is more fundamental are avoided.

Diversity mainstreaming in this version facilitates the mapping of a multitude of possible forms of discrimination. It thereby allows for the understanding of gender relations in their specific context as well as articulating their relations to other structures of inequality, such as class, ethnicity, nationality and sexual orientation among others. Such an approach would have a practical influence upon research designs, the development of improved research methods to uncover key aspects of intersectional subordination, and methods of data collection. It is evident that such suggestions, if followed, could translate into more sophisticated and complicated analytical strategies, as has been demonstrated by the FEMCIT project.³¹ It is, however, less clear what the political effects of a more sophisticated analysis would be. This would include a thorough revision of:

- a) the ways in which gender policies are conducted as well as a revision of the institutional frameworks;
- b) a transformation of women's movements into movements dealing with broader gender-related issues.

Current gender networks in Copenhagen and other metropolises who address both anti-capitalist, postcolonial and intimate citizenship issues might be a laboratory for this new kind of movements and networks. Similarly, the Gay Pride events and movements currently gaining momentum and mobilising beyond the core communities of gay people may be opportune. However, compared to the

³¹ For a simple and informative approach see Valiulis and Redmond (2007).

gender based organizations and movements they are still at an embryo stage. Especially, when compared to the experiences of the women's movements and organisations, who themselves draw upon the experience gleaned from a long 20th century tradition of coalition-building and lobbying.

At present, it seems as if the terminology and outlook of gender mainstreaming is maintained at both institutional and NGO levels. But it also seems that the different agents in institutions and NGOs are seeking to extend and supplement it with the explorative and critical reflections of intersectionality. All along, we suggest, gender is made a more flexible and dynamic concept open for applications at empirical, cultural and analytical levels in policymaking. In the following, we will elaborate on the idea of gender as a vital analytical category in relation to gender mainstreaming.

“What are we mainstreaming when we mainstream gender?”

The launching of gender mainstreaming at the Beijing Conference in 1995 marked a shift in institutional discourse and terminology. The introduction of gender mainstreaming (instead of women as a focal point) was clearly influenced by feminist scholarship, where gender had been introduced as a construction and as an analytical category during the 1980s. In the UN context, the shift in terminology became subject to contestations, resulting in the appointment of a specific contact group on gender, prior to the conference. The goal was to seek agreement on the commonly understood meaning of the term “gender” related to the Platform for Action. The statement from the group was clearly meant to calm down conservative and religious communities and governments, who preferred to maintain the term woman as a more “natural” category. The statement was made part of the final report of the Beijing conference. Here the turn to gender was expressed as a pragmatic turn in saying “that the word “gender” had been commonly used and understood in its ordinary generally accepted usage in numerous other United Nations forums and conferences”. Moreover it was assured that “there was no indication that any new meaning or connotation of the term, different from accepted prior usage, was intended in the Platform for Action”(Contact Group on Gender, Note and Annex A/Conf.177/L2. July 7, 1995).³²

So far, from a rather ironic angle, it seems as if the promise has been kept. In their article “*What are we mainstreaming when we mainstream gender?*” (2005), Eveline and Bacchi argue that the terminological and conceptual shift itself, from women to gender, has not so far brought about any substantial changes. This means at best that gender mainstreaming has not yet moved beyond the integrationist and (implicit) essentialist male/female dichotomy of liberal and 2nd wave feminism (Eveline and Bacchi 2005, Hankivsky 2005).

³² The issue of terminology and possible displacements was critically dealt with by the Holy Sea during the Beijing Conference. Cf. conference proceedings.

In recent decades, the idea of gender has been a contested concept in feminist theory. And the idea of gender in gender mainstreaming can accordingly be related to critical questions of essentialism, universalism and ethnocentrism that feminist theory has been struggling with.³³ Different subtexts and understandings of gender might be attached to different reform approaches and initiatives. And particular ways of conceptualising gender, as substantiated by Judith Squires, influence the effectiveness of the mainstreaming strategy. In sum, gender is a slippery term and meanings and terminologies might work out in ways that maintain the status quo (Eveline and Bacchi 497).

Eveline and Bacchi have explored the lack of correspondence between current theoretical and political developments and the possible application of a more dynamic, bodily located idea of gender. In line with other scholars they suggest that gender mainstreaming models/strategies need to incorporate a more dynamic idea of gender. In particular, they must include a view on gender as an active process of gendering rather than assuming that gender is a static and natural category. In brief, they make a plea for the application of gender as a verb rather than as noun.

At the same time they question the ability of gender mainstreaming to move beyond current political practices of placing men and women in fixed categories. In so doing, they also moderate the hopes and aspirations that have been associated with revised versions of the notion. The elaboration of a more dynamic version of gendering, they claim, would imply the incorporation of a feminist ontology of the body: a (trans-) corporeal approach; as well as the conception of gender as an unfinished process. Accordingly, such a version of gender mainstreaming would always be partial and incomplete.³⁴

Eveline and Bacchi also consult theories that interrogate the body, theories that offer possibilities for non-dualistic interpretations of gender relations and dynamics. In line with a Foucault-inspired notion, they argue for power as a multiplicity of effects through which being and identity are situated and known. But the expressive effects of power are not seen as simply representational, because the body is both the locus of thought and that which remains necessarily un-thought.³⁵ This means that what is said about the body, identity and power is always incomplete, despite the ongoing striving in organised language and cultural formations to orchestrate the “truth”. Accordingly, feminists need to address both the fixed political realities that organise our social possibilities, while simultaneously experimenting with the incomplete and hardly understood micro-political possibilities that our lived experiences create.

³³ Most of the references in this and the following notes come from Eveline and Bacchi. See Mohanty (2003: 221-251), Butler (1990).

³⁴ In the so-called “doing gender” school, the idea of gender as process or as a verb is well-known. West and Zimmerman, who launched the idea, used ethno-methodology to show how gender is done. But they are criticised by Bacchi and others for fixing the categories of masculine and feminine as universally oppositional and beyond change.

³⁵ Again inspired by Foucault, elaborations made by Gatens and Colebrook state the incompleteness of both embodied and political processes. See Gatens (1996: 162-187).

Eveline and Bacchi explicitly argue for the incorporation of critical studies of men and masculinities, substantiating the insight that contemporary gender relations pose a problem for both men and women (Hobson and Morgan 2002, Kimmel, Hearn &Connell 2005). The idea of hegemonic masculinity, or rather masculinities, has been central here, in order to show that some, but not all men benefit from the prevailing gender regime (Connell 1995). In order to avoid any essentialist or universal views of masculinity, the notion is now talked about in the plural.

Embedded in this rather complicated notion of gender is the idea that the process of conducting a gender analysis of policy does not have a foreseen end point. Rather it must be an ongoing process that lasts as long as policymaking endures. This complies with recent approaches in intersectional analysis, focused on fluid and becoming processes of categories (beyond gender), rather than the interaction between fixed categories as accentuated in the sociological and political science literature (Søndergaard and Staunæs 2006: 48-49).

We find Eveline and Bacchi's interventions highly relevant. They are an invitation to all parties involved (policymakers, practitioners and public servants) to reflect and make ideas of gender more dynamic and flexible. Also very important is the stress on gender mainstreaming as a knowledge-based strategy, where knowledge about the complexities of gender and power is conditional. One limitation, however, is that they do not deal explicitly with diversity aspects. In that sense their approach can be seen as a way of sophisticating the existing ideas of mainstreaming where gender is maintained as the central category.

The critical question then is this: How can this complicated idea of gender and other categories, containing both body and culture, both masculinity and femininity, be transposed to the politics of gender mainstreaming? How can such insights, from the always partial and unfinished business of gendering, be connected to the practice of gender mainstreaming? Can gender mainstreaming accommodate an understanding of gender as an unfinished and embodied process? And vice versa: Can (trans-) corporeal gender theories reach out and accommodate contemporary creation of equality policies?³⁶

Perspectives and implications

The challenges that are implicated in the multiple ideas and political practices of gender mainstreaming are, of course, nested in other and more all-encompassing paradoxes and dilemmas in feminism and feminist research. Yet the critical interrogations of gender mainstreaming also reflect deeper tensions within feminism, attributed to the latter's dual character as both an analytical and a politically prescriptive project. So far the implications of feminist analysis in general have been to offer

³⁶ For more on trans-corporeal gender theories see Alaimo (2010).

both a diagnosis of women's and men's status across cultures and to offer a prescription for changing the situation of women, who are understood to be marginalised, subordinated or oppressed.

Gradually, men have also been included in this paradigm, along with other axes of inequality. How have the tensions between analytical and political interventions been negotiated in the framework of gender mainstreaming? And how can they be made productive for both?

The broader quest for diversity mainstreaming and intersectional approaches adds new and critical edges to this very tension. Do the ideas of the intersectional/diversity approach imply a new and more advanced stage in feminist analysis and activism, where gender still forms the focal point? Or do they imply a vanishing moment, the end of feminist analysis and activism in its late 20th century "conventional" form. That is, do they imply a new beginning in which feminist analysis and activism become moulded and mainstreamed into a general critical methodology in which gender may or may not play a part?

Chapter 3: Gender mainstreaming: Lost or multiplied in translation – institutional practices and dilemmas



Gender mainstreaming has been criticised for lacking a strong theoretical framework and providing little criteria for implementation within diverse state practices (Booth and Benneth 2002). Hankivsky and others have argued that a disconnection between the practice of gender mainstreaming and its feminist theoretical basis has resulted in the “most overlooked impediment to GM's growth and impact” (Hankivsky 2005: 978); the strategy gets “lost in translation” (Hankivsky 2005: 984).

In the following we will question the assumption that the problems of implementing the strategy of gender mainstreaming is caused by a lack of theory. The understanding of gender mainstreaming as ‘lost in translation’ signifies an idea of an original, i.e. a hierarchy where something or someone has the right to define and set the right standards. Rather than following this idea, we shall emphasise an approach where the strategy, while talked about and worked upon by different agents, is defined and developed in ways that are at least as important as the theoretical framework.

Our approach will mainly consider national discourses on gender mainstreaming and diversity. Hence, in this chapter, we will focus on countries where discourses on gender and diversity mainstreaming seem to be most elaborated. When we considered our empirical material, we found that Spain and also Poland (to some extent) were less able to amplify a gender mainstreaming strategy in their respective context. This may be due to the fact that Spain was in a beginning phase, establishing a new Ministry for equality, when we did the interviews in 2008. Poland was also in many ways less elaborated on the content of the strategy, focusing more on inertia and lack of resources. Because of these aspects, in the following we will mainly concentrate on discourses of gender and diversity mainstreaming in the three countries where we found rather comprehensive discussions and reflections on the strategy, namely Germany, Austria and Norway. Norway was included in the project in a later phase compared to the other countries, and because of this we did not do any qualitative interviews in Norway. Yet, we chose to include Norway because of the turn to a diversity focus in the Norwegian equality politics. Our empirical material regarding Norway is based on articles, reports and the quantitative survey, which included Norway from the beginning.

Departing from these reflections, this chapter shall focus on three main aspects:

- Which dilemmas related to gender mainstreaming are expressed by agents and practitioners working with the strategy?
- How do they relate to the bureaucratic and the participatory models of gender mainstreaming?
- How and where do diversity perspectives enter in the work on equality?

As described in the first chapter, the aspirations of gender mainstreaming have been spelled out in two frameworks focusing on institutional strategies and on broader and more inclusive ideas of democracy

and mobilisation of women (Beveridge and Nott 2002, Walby 2005). They can briefly be outlined as follows:

1. An expert or bureaucratic model of mainstreaming that focus on organisational change, on the use of experts and the importance of strategy-building. In this model, gender ought to be incorporated into all policies at all levels and stages by agents normally involved in policy-making, i.e. into the routine operations and core functions of any given organisations.
2. A participatory-democratic model of gender mainstreaming that promotes networking, dialogue, social mobilisation and the involvement of NGOs in all stages of policy-making. This model calls for the building of alliances between civil servants, politicians, academics, women's movements as well as other social organisations and the media.

We find this distinction useful for approaching and identifying the character of gender mainstreaming. In the following sections, we will relate our empirical findings to the dimensions within the two models. Against this background, we will discuss the implications and outcomes that these two approaches to gender mainstreaming might have. However, we will also question if they can be understood in such separation as presented above.

The chapter shall focus on how gender and diversity mainstreaming is perceived and produced in selected governmental and women's movement's settings. To some extent it relocates earlier research on gender mainstreaming, for example the work by Hafner-Burton and Pollack (2000). Their focus on gender mainstreaming in the EU context concentrates on the procedural aspects and not on implementation, as they stated that little or no data were yet available.

In the following we shall develop our discursive approach further by asking questions, such as: How is gender mainstreaming perceived and understood? How is it articulated and problematised? And how is the strategy implemented in practice?

As previously mentioned, the chapter will analyse the practical implementation of gender mainstreaming. We find the perspective vital; in line with other scholars, e.g. Bacchi and Eveline 2005, we recognise that practices support the strategy to be institutionalised and might provide valuable inputs for the advancements aimed at by the EU.

Contrasting practices and different ideas

In the following, we would like to show the range of complications that surfaced along with the implementation of gender mainstreaming. In this context, the German case turned out to epitomise the dilemmas involved. In Germany the implementation of gender mainstreaming on the federal level was presented as a reform programme in the framework of the federal government administration. The

aim was to enable and qualify employees of the federal administration to orientate their work towards gender equality. The procedure applied for the implementation came close to what has been described above in the administrative or bureaucratic model of gender mainstreaming. Our data show that this model raised several forms of resistance, both general resistance when working with something 'foreign' or 'new' but also resistance against the notion of gender equality.

In a written interview with a German expert centre on gender mainstreaming, it was described how the strategy had a turbulent implementation in Germany and how this turbulence could be understood as both a general resistance and a resistance against the strategy itself:

"establishing GM as part of the standard proceedings meant to impose responsibilities for the integration of gender aspects on all employees within their scope of activities. For many employees, this new functional task led to displeasure and rejection. This resistance is in part general, occurring during almost all transformation processes. Some of these resistances were specifically directed against the very notion of GM, others against the goals of GM or against equal opportunities in general. Here it is important to distinguish."

The previously described bureaucratic model of gender mainstreaming implies that agents involved in policy-making adopt a gender perspective into their work. This task might be met with resistance caused by a confusion of the meaning of the term gender mainstreaming. Seeing that, the very term is in need of translation and substantiation. In many cases the substantiation of the strategy was linked to the training of professionals without specific knowledge on gender issues. For example, this was the case in Poland, who say that:

"It is a very delicate issue. For us it is obvious, but it is not obvious for the administration. It is frustrating.(...) We have the training in process and will start to train people from the Ministry of Labour in November, since nobody knows what it means".

The procedure of translation was evaluated in rather critical terms by a centrally placed German public servant. She described how the former implementation of gender mainstreaming in Germany was characterised as being very technically orientated, pointing instead to the recent shift in German equality to work towards a more goal orientated approach:

"...there was only focus in the technical part of the gender mainstreaming. We made certain manuals where we said: How do you gender mainstreaming when you do laws, in doing public relations, in reports or when you are having your research done? What are the aspects you have in mind when you have to do different things with a focus in gender? We did these manuals, made tools, had rooms ect. The ministries were trained – everyone working there, even the minister. But that was years ago and when there is an election everyone are new and you have to start again. We were very busy in all these technical aspects. Everyone rang up here and asked how to gender a law for example that didn't have anything to do with

women, and we had to explain to them that it does have women issues or that it has different outcome when you look at men and women. That they had to take these things into account and had to describe it and none of them wanted to do it."

This clearly states the bureaucratic approach to gender mainstreaming as the main approach in German gender mainstreaming practice. The criticism indicates that the all encompassing aim of the strategy turned out to be too broad for practical implementation and hence difficult to define in terms of 'relevance for all'. The critique can be captured by an expression by Pollack and Hafner-Burton saying: "If gender is everybody's responsibility in general, then it's nobody's responsibility in particular." (Pollack and Hafner-Burton 2000: 452). Furthermore, the German civil servant saw the general and more technical perspectives on gender mainstreaming as an invitation to focus on details rather than addressing more important and prominent policies:

"...we were mostly busy with small technical things, unimportant things while big changes and big reforms went by ungendered. The big social reform, the big pension reform.. While we were still busy with unimportant laws and to convince."

Facing these problems, the German approach to gender mainstreaming has recently been changed to a more narrow focus, meaning that gender relevant subjects are defined and communicated as priorities for the work on gender equality:

"We take just some few subjects and then we are really communicating that this is gender mainstreaming. Then everybody understands, even the big public. Before no one understood."

This more narrow approach reminds us of earlier gender equality approaches, where the goals of gender equality were addressed to specific areas and not directed to the mainstream. However, the civil servant herself maintains this new approach to be mainstreaming gender. Yet, she argues that the change in strategy is just a matter of technical versus content focus.

The cases illustrate the kind of problems faced in implementing gender mainstreaming in bureaucracies, problems due to ambiguous meanings and terminologies, and institutional inertia. These obstacles implicate the need to involve agents who do not normally work on or have knowledge of gender and equality issues. We will later return to this.

Turning to the other more democratic model of gender mainstreaming, the agents who most actively support this participatory orientated approach are (not surprisingly) the women's organizations and NGOs, who refer to the Beijing Platform for Action (BPfA). Accordingly, an Austrian women's organization (OeFR) criticise a neglect of the importance of involving women's organizations:

"The OeFR commends the re-establishment of a Ministry for Women in 2007 and its efforts to continuing and constructive co-operation and partnership with the wider NGO community. According to all relevant documents from the BPfA to the Beijing+10 Review such partnership and support is highly recommended

and the involvement of NGOs "...especially women's organizations..." seen as crucial to the full and accelerated implementation of the BPfA and follow-up documents. The OeFR believes this co-operation should be intensified and widened as well as institutionalized. The OeFR appreciates and welcomes financial support given to some NGOs. However, a sound planning of activities and the running of routine operations by NGOs would only be possible if grants were guaranteed on a long-term basis".³⁷

In general, women's movements use more positive and satisfactory terms towards the participatory model than the bureaucratic model of gender mainstreaming. This is in itself not surprising, because of the movements' general aim to be included as agents of change in public and political life. At a broader level, the more positive sentiments towards the participatory model can also be explained by the fact that agents included in that model are included because of their competences on gender equality. This is often not the case for the bureaucratic model, where public employees without any expertise on gender are encouraged or forced to integrate a gender perspective in their work. This is, fundamentally, a more troublesome point of departure. We will continue to elaborate on these challenging aspects in the next section.

It is striking that the interviewed governmental units also emphasised the cooperation and integration of NGOs and women's organizations as part of gender mainstreaming. In Poland, for example, the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All boosted the involvement of women's NGOs in the broad equality agenda and public policies. An advisory committee composed of representatives of non-governmental organizations and social partners, established during the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All (2007), subsequently became a governmental advisory committee. The aim here was to create a platform of understanding between the institutions of civil society for counteracting discrimination. The advisory committee became the first advisory body in the Polish Department for Women, Family and Counteracting Discrimination appointed by the minister. After 2007, the meetings of the committee became part of a project co-financed by the Community Programme PROGRESS. But the meetings were based on the model established during the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All.

Processes of translation

How are challenges of theory and practice met by the agents working with gender mainstreaming in practice? Booth and Bennett have argued that gender mainstreaming is a 'fuzzy' concept with little contact to the theoretical background (Booth and Bennett 2002: 433). Our interviews showed that barriers for working with gender mainstreaming in practice are not necessarily caused by missing

³⁷ From the response to the Austrian answers to the questionnaire on Implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

theories. A well developed theoretical background does not inevitably guarantee practical implementation; and moreover: experts and networks on gender mainstreaming do not yield successful implementation.

As already described, civil servants who are not gender experts and who are expected to work with gender mainstreaming do often not see the relevance of gender or equality in their specific area. Otherwise, they might be uncertain about how to use the strategy. Such problems are articulated in an interview with the representative from the Austrian inter-ministerial group working on gender mainstreaming (IMAG):

“The theoretical basis is very good but the practice is quite different. (...) Gender mainstreaming is still in a learning process. The federal chancellery which is responsible for the coordination gave some guidelines in the legal process, and in the budgeting process and the administration. And then we have ministerial council decisions on this that all ministries should adopt it and work with it, which is rather difficult but it is all nice words.”

And she continues:

“We have good legislation now and we have the strategies, we have been doing a lot of these guidelines and there are events. Maybe the expectations are too high about gender mainstreaming. You can not change the book from one day to another.”

A strong theoretical basis is not enough, as demonstrated above where the practical side is distinguished from theory and pointed out as being ‘still in its learning process’. Phrased this way, there is no direct link between theory and practice. According to the Austrian civil servant a crucial barrier for the implementation is the blurring of concepts and the lack of content:

“I criticize that there is no real aim in this process. What does it mean that we want gender equality for women and men? (...) The strategy of equal opportunities is not defined. Some will say that equality means independence and others that it means that the women are free to stay home.”

Equality is said to be the goal of gender mainstreaming, but the lack of a clear definition makes equality an empty concept open for interpretations. This lack might itself complicate the implementation of gender mainstreaming. Besides that, gender mainstreaming has been blamed for focusing too much on procedures, for forgetting the outcome and focusing too intensely on the strategy itself. This is an overall insight also at the level of the UN, which has worked extensively with the elaboration of gender mainstreaming. As expressed by the DAW representative, *“I think there has been too much talk about mainstreaming as the goal in itself. Then you forget, what is the outcome, if that’s the goal?”* She highlighted that the blurring of means and outcome is a common misunderstanding.

In this regard, it seems as if scholars on gender mainstreaming have pointed to some weak points; Hankivsky has asked: Has gender mainstreaming clearly defined what gender and equality are? Who and what constitutes the issues of gender mainstreaming? (Hankivsky 2005: 987). Also, Booth and Bennett point out that practitioners seem to use different definitions of gender mainstreaming and that this will have an impact on implementation. They call for a clearer definition of gender mainstreaming, arguing its necessity for an identification of the practical actions needed (Booth and Bennett 2002: 432).

The notion of gender mainstreaming

To follow up on the previous chapter discussing terminology and practice, as well as the understandings and definitions of gender mainstreaming discussed above, this section will elaborate more empirically on what and where we are mainstreaming when we mainstream gender. The section will concentrate on questions such as: How does language influence practices? And in which contexts is equality situated?

It is well known that the perception of 'gender' has been a battle field. Currently multiple understandings of gender and related questions are posed: Is gender a fixed or dynamic category? Should the focus be on one, two or more genders? As we have pointed out previously, gender seems to be a slippery term that can be used for different purposes; sometimes, it can even be used to maintain status quo (Eveline and Bacchi 2005: 497).

From the theoretical perspectives outlined in the first chapter, it can be argued that in the strategy of gender mainstreaming gender should be made more inclusive, containing both body and culture, and both femininity and masculinity (Eveline and Bacchi 2005). In the following, we shall confront the quest for broader and more flexible ideas of gender with the strategic and practical use of gender in public institutions and among NGOs.

In our empirical material, we found that the concept of gender was contested and so was the concept of equality, but so also were the broader concepts of diversity and theoretical dimensions. We will return to the latter. Presently, we will further elaborate the notion of gender as it was expressed in our interviews.

Generally, we found that the concept of gender was problematised. Many organizations used the term 'gender' but clearly had 'women' in mind. This was expressed more explicitly in our interview with the representative from EWL:

"We all say gender equality although for me, I'm trying to speak about women more often because gender can hide women and in some instances is what we want to see is women, not always, and I'm not to much

into theories but for me it is important that we try to still say what we mean which is, ok gender might be a trendy, more sexy concept but for some organisations is easier to speak about gender than to speak about women's rights but for me, personally, it's an issue, internally in many documents we are a bit careful, we still use women's rights."

But understanding gender as foremost related to women was also shown to be problematic. The difficulties in working with women's issues in the mainstream were, for example, expressed by a women's organization in Austria as caused by thinking of women's issues as not relevant for the mainstream:

"I would say that gender mainstreaming is not really in our political system. If you look at the legislation in other areas, they will not think of gender related problems. In Austria people still think of it as a 'women's thing', and it is not in the mainstream."

This aspect confronts the core of the strategy's aim, to relocate gender equality from the marginal or local positions into the mainstream. Our interviews showed that the aspect of 'mainstream' was a central problem for the strategy, due to several obstacles related to recognitions, definitions and terminology of gender, women or equality. Also our quantitative survey showed a certain inertia in the inclusion of gender mainstreaming. In the box below you see an almost equal division of countries, which did not have 'gender mainstreaming' applied in their public equality legislation and countries which did.

The word 'gender mainstreaming' is applied in equality legislation	The word 'gender mainstreaming' is not applied in equality legislation
8 BE, BG, DK, GE, LT, NO, PL, SL	9 CY, CZ, EE, HU, IE, LV, LU, MT, SK

Figure 1: Numbers of countries which did not apply the term 'gender mainstreaming in their equality legislation.

Even if a large share of countries did not use the term 'gender mainstreaming' in their legislation, all departments maintained that they worked with the strategy in their current initiatives. And regarding the NGOs, almost all had integrated the strategy of gender mainstreaming in recent projects.

Gender mainstreaming has been a strategy in recent initiatives	Gender mainstreaming has not been a strategy in recent initiatives
14	4

Figure 2: Numbers of NGOs which have worked with the strategy of gender mainstreaming in recent projects.

We shall continue by looking more at the terminological problems and their consequences. In the Sixth Report on CEDAW by the Federal Republic of Germany, the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth makes terminological issues explicit in saying that:

“the adoption of the English-language concept of “gender mainstreaming” led to resistance in some quarters, which prevented the sustainable establishment of the goal of gender equality in some contexts”.

Because of the (in this case, historically rooted) resistance to the very notion of gender mainstreaming, the ministry reformulated the strategy, in what was called a 'conceptual reorientation'. Three core concerns were suggested: 1) equal participation of women in the working world; 2) reduction of gender-specific risk, and support for women in gender-specific crisis situations; and 3) overcoming role stereotypes, for example by addressing men as partners.

As we have discussed previously, this reorientation in the German equality work can be understood as a turn to equality policies that focus on distinctive areas and not on the mainstream. That is, it lacks an attempt to integrate a gender perspective in all public programmes and policies, instead focusing on distinctive areas. This was exactly the criticism raised by German women’s organizations, as expressed in their shadow report to CEDAW:

“As described in its Sixth Periodic Report (section A I: “Equality Policy as a Strategy for Success”), the German government has abandoned the equality strategy of gender mainstreaming. A new equality strategy to replace this principle or activities to put gender budgeting into practice are not evident.”
(Alliance of German Women’s Organizations 2008: 1)

Confronted with these problems of the term itself, the German civil servant acknowledged the discussion as having had an importance for the implementation of gender mainstreaming. Yet she interpreted the criticism as a question of resistance against the strategy, rather than against the concept:

“when it comes to IT, Ipods and everything is [in] English, and everyone is happy to speak English. If you look at a lot of things you see it. But just gender mainstreaming, that’s a word they don’t want to work with.”

Hence she questioned the genuine reasons expressed by the sceptics and saw it as a question of principally gender related issues rather than a problem with an English term. Moreover, she explained the turn to another approach as a way to avoid the bureaucratic excesses of gender mainstreaming:

“people said that we were not following the same concept any more because you have eradicated the word of mainstreaming. Its ridicules. So we don’t talk about gender mainstreaming any more, but about gender equality as we did years ago. And we avoid working too much with the tools and manuals for gender equality. Now we are trying to make it clear to everybody with the less but bigger projects.”

As the civil servant expressed, gender mainstreaming is replaced with the concept of gender equality, in order to leave out some of the more instrumental and overly bureaucratic aspects of the strategy. But also the concept of equality is contested and can cause problems – something that we will discuss below.

Notions of equality

It is well known that different nations, organisations and movements have defined gender equality in various ways. According to the well developed literature on welfare and gender regimes, the Nordic region has held gender equality and social services to be linked to individual rights. Whereas in Continental and Southern Europe, these have been associated with gender differences, complimentary roles and family affairs (Esping Andersen 1990, Sainsbury 1999, Jenson 2009).

In Germany, the women's organization expressed concerns about how this path dependency and focus on family affairs has recently over-layered the focus on gender. A stronger focus on family affairs was welcomed by the organization. But at the same time they feared that a shift in policies from 'women's affairs' to 'family affairs', e.g. a focus on gender roles within the family, would marginalise women's issues. That is, they feared that women's issues would only be considered relevant if they were part of family affairs:

“What we do not understand is the shift from equality for women to equality. It came with the new minister. She is very interested in promoting family affairs and to see women as a member of a family. (...) It gives some old traditional roles: The men earn the money and the women stay at home and look after the children. So it is a very difficult subject for us.”

The German women's movement worries about the risks for backlash if equality is not addressed properly. In the case described above, the concern is that the notion of equality understood as women's individual rights might be overruled by a focus on family aspects, thereby causing traditional, i.e. not equal or fair, gender roles. However, a step towards more family concerned equality politics was also found in the Polish case and expressed below in the interview with the central civil servant in the Polish Department for Women, Family and Counteracting Discrimination:

“We tried to put the policy of gender mainstreaming into the question of family. (...) With the family focus it is a change of thinking, since the biggest problem is that women who want a child is not very good prepared for that. We don't have good policies for that, so the thinking was to give possibilities to combine with work life. We created a law equal treatment. We have already a law which speaks about equal treatment for women and men in the labour market. But now we want to go a bit more horizontal, some civil law.”

In accordance with the institutional strategy, the German civil servant also pointed to how new knowledge-based understandings might yield new perspectives in understanding gender (in)equality. The recent focus on 'life spans' in German equality politics relates equality to people's choices and the way these choices determine life situations and positions:

“The new aspect that we are having now in our gender equality policy is that we look at the course of life. We don’t just want to look at status. If one is a single parent family, but we want to look at the dynamics and what the breaks are. What happens during a life circle where there are several parts you have to decide about and what path you take and what will follow up. For example if you get a training for a job which are typical for females then you will have a less income, less chances for career. Once you have decided for this type of job it is very hard to get out of it. It’s the same when you are deciding what to study. The next focus is when you marry. What partner will you choose and what you are planning for the career? Who will be the one focusing on career and who has to follow? What will you do when there are children? Will there be a re-traditioning when the first child comes? Is one of the partners going to stay at home and who will it be? Or who will reduce working time? When the children don’t need the same support anymore will the person go back to work again? Will the other one help? Will he or she reduce working time so the other one can start a new work in life?”

The core concern in the above expressed strategy to gender equality is related to family roles. But the concept of equality is broadened out to include all members of the family, i.e. meaning both men and women. The German ministry for equality has launched a new directorate only with the focus on boys and men. As pointed out by Bergman in FEMCIT WP2 (D 7.11 FEMCIT Policy Document 2010: 12), it seems as if a focus on men as part of the struggle for gender equality has entered the agenda.

The focus on men as important agents of change can be traced in the new German 'partner month' (Väter Monaten) aimed at encouraging more men to take time off from work to care for their children, and suggesting that men encourage their wives to return to their career after having children.

Earnings-related Parental Allowance was introduced in 2007, encouraging equal sharing. These initiatives have led to an increased share of fathers claiming parental pay from 3.5% in 2006 to 16% in 2009 (UN 2009: REGIONAL REVIEW OF PROGRESS – Achievements and challenges in promoting gender equality in the ECE region by country).

The different targets of equality interventions are, in some degree, determined by translations of strategies. The aspects of translation and practice discussed in the previous sections show that terminology and definitions of both gender and equality have an influence on the appearance of gender mainstreaming; in particular, they influence the substantiation and the implementation of the strategy. Different translations might include different targets. We hereby understand the process of translation as an important part of the dynamic interactions between movements, public administration and the political elements working with gender equality. On this basis, we suggest that various complex understandings of gender and equality have to be included in evaluations and discussions of gender mainstreaming.

From gender to diversity

As we have previously elaborated, a diversity approach has entered the EU equality agenda and influenced focus and strategy on member state levels. This section will elaborate more on diversity mainstreaming by asking questions such as: How is the diversity approach talked about and promoted? That is, how is diversity problematised within public institutions and women's organizations?

We will initiate this section with an example from the Norwegian equality strategy. In 2008, the former Norwegian minister of Children and Equality, Anniken Huitfeldt³⁸, expressed an extension of the equality strategy from a gender focus to a broader focus including several discrimination grounds. Introducing the ministry's future equality objectives, she stated:

"I am committed to the work for equality. In this context the term "equality" was formerly used to refer mainly to gender equality, but today it encompasses equal rights and opportunities for many more groups. Working for equality involves combating discrimination on grounds of age, gender, religion, functional ability, sexual orientation or other personal attributes." (Norwegian Ministry of Children and Equality 2008: Gender Equality 2009? Objectives, strategy and measures for ensuring gender equality: 4)

With the relatively recent establishment of a Gender Equality and Anti-discrimination Ombud, Norway attempts to integrate the perspective of diversity within a gender equality agenda. In a study on the new Ombud, Bygnes (2010) argues that the Ombud might face difficulties in treating gender and other discrimination variables equally, since the Ombud derives from former institutions with a main focus on gender equality. Examining a report published by the Ombud (the SaLDO 2007 report), she points out that gender is still the main focus for the institution (Bygnes 2010: 91). Concentrating her focus on how the report speaks about gender and ethnicity, Brygnes shows that ethnicity is certainly mentioned, but in an overall picture the perspective is weak and it is the exception rather than the rule to embrace ethnicity in the same line as gender. This is the case in all main areas of the joint Ombud; though, in relation to working life, discrimination grounds like ethnicity, age, disability and sexuality are better incorporated, and the intersection between gender and ethnicity is treated with some attention (SaLDO report 2007: 45; Bygnes 2010: 93). Bygnes argues that the generally stronger focus on gender can also be interpreted as a conception of gender discrimination as similar to other discrimination grounds. And that from this thinking follows the idea that these approaches and techniques are valid for all kinds of anti-discrimination work.

The data deriving from our own quantitative survey show that most public departments on gender equality are working with an intersectional perspective, i.e. only three out of the 17 responding public

³⁸ Since October 2009 Audun Lysbakken has been the minister of Children and Equality and Anniken Huitfeldt became the minister of culture.

departments on gender equality answered that they only focus on gender equality. As illustrated in the table below: age, political views, ethnicity, race and sexuality are among the most common anti-discrimination areas.

Focus areas besides gender	Number of public departments
Age	12
Disabilities	10
Race	11
Ethnicity	12
Sexuality	10
Religion/beliefs	5
Family Status	3
Political Views	12
Other	1

Figure 3: The distribution of focus areas by the public departments on gender equality that worked with other discrimination grounds than gender.

Our survey also showed that the NGOs were mainly concerned with labour market and political representation/democracy in their equality work. Domestic violence and family issues were also main focus areas. But rather surprisingly, very few worked with ethnicity/race as a target. As seen in the table below, only 5 NGOs worked with ethnicity and race.

Key areas and goals	Number of NGOs
Labour market	16
Family issues	11
Political representation and democracy	17
Domestic violence	13
Prostitution	4
Trafficking	4
Sexuality	4
Ethnicity and Race	5
Other	18

Figure 4: The focus areas of the 18 NGOs that participated in the survey.

As discussed in the previous chapters, often a “one size fits all” approach to multiple discrimination is wrongly based on the assumption of sameness of the social categories (Verloo 2006: 223; Bygnes 2010: 96). It will be important for institutions incorporating the new diversity approach to engage with expert organizations, to get new and valuable input for improving and adapting the old frames to this new agenda. Here the more participatory model of gender mainstreaming might contribute to an institutional frame for implementation.

Structural and organizational resistance

We will focus in more detail on incorporation of diversity in public institutions. Moving to this setting, the German civil servant formulates how they integrate diversity within the gender agenda:

“I like to call it gender diversity. You never just look at gender. You have to take all the different women into account. And if you look at diversity you can’t take gender as something next to the others because it’s laying on top of all. So we are very aware of it, but it’s not easy to follow in politics.”

The uneasiness of the diversity perspective in politics as expressed above could be caused by the structural frames as expressed by the same agent:

“We are here for gender equality, then you have disabled in another ministry and migration and integration in another one. So we don’t have this broad approach in the government.”

Our interviews showed that a structural inertia for cooperation on diversity issues is often the result of separated responsibilities for different discrimination grounds. Though, in our quantitative survey the governmental units seemed to be more positive about the diversity agenda compared to women’s organizations. Besides Czech Republic, all public departments on gender equality understood equality mainstreaming, i.e. the diversity approach as a supplement to the strategy of gender mainstreaming. More NGOs than public departments showed to be sceptical towards equality mainstreaming. Bulgaria, France, Ireland, Romania and Sweden were the five countries, which saw the diversity approach as a challenge and possible threat to gender equality.

A common argument for seeing equality mainstreaming as a supplement rather than an impediment was that the diversity approach helped to ensure that no discrimination ground was left out of focus. This was expressed in a note by the Polish department for gender equality:

“Gender division of the society is the basic one. Building on that much other kind of inequalities may occur resulting in multiple discriminations. That it is why equality mainstreaming is treated as a supplement to gender mainstreaming. This approach let us also not to favour one kind of discrimination over the other.”

Also other kinds of scepticism against the diversity perspective stood out in our interviews. In the interviews with gender equality agents from Austria, issues surrounding the integration of a broader perspective on ‘diversity’ rather than solely on ‘gender’ were expressed as problematic. As the representative from the IMAG in the Austrian government formulated it:

“I think the main thing is still equality between men and women, and the diversity is something else. I do not agree that diversity is gender mainstreaming. I know that people now they want to mix it, and say that it’s all in all. We have all this diversity now in our equal treatment act, since the thought is that ‘we already have an equal treatment act for women and men, so we put this in it too, it is all the same’. It is not the same, because it is between gender or sexes, and in the diversity you have both sexes in it.”

In general, our interviews back up FEMCIT’s findings, where it is stated that: “Ethnic minority women’s interests are recognised and accepted as legitimate, but are often portrayed as ‘different’

from white women's interests" (FEMCIT WP4 paper 23 September 2010: 17). Similar expression was found in our interview with the German women's NGO, describing the lacking cooperation between ethnic majority women's organizations and ethnic minority organizations as a problem of interests:

"We have now a member organization, which is the organization of women migrants in the federal public. It has been a difficult point, not because we don't want them, but sometimes immigrants are very closed societies and this aspect of integration, which is important, is not always the focus. They are working on themselves and are not very open."

She thereby express the strong sense of 'us' versus 'them' discussed and criticised in and about feminist theories and feminism, though she places the responsibility for the diversion of interest and non-cooperation on the ethnic minority women. Likewise, the Austrian women's organization expressed how they wish to include the diversity aspect, but that other more traditional women's organizations often object in the interest of preserving the gendered perspective, i.e. the women's perspective:

"We don't cooperate with NGOs with focus on other issues than gender, and I think that's a big problem in Austria, that the people are more related to one ground and the cooperation is not so good. (...) We were the only one who wanted to take part of this [focus on racism and disability], because normally they say 'No, women have to be something different'. (...) I am from another opinion and I think that the gender mainstreaming concept is more approached."

The agent above expresses an understanding of gender mainstreaming as open for other discrimination grounds; cf. the relocation from former equality strategies, where gender mainstreaming changes the focus from women as a group to a focus on gender and intersections with other discrimination grounds (Brade et al. 2004). Her point of view is related to another FEMCIT finding, stating that: "Ethnic majority women's organisations are beginning to reflect on the need to change their own agendas and claims-making in order to accommodate, integrate and reflect minority women's interests" (FEMCIT paper Gendered Citizenship in Europe: Issues, Challenges, Visions. Brussels 23 September 2010: 17. WP4). But she also expresses the fear for losing gender, or indeed the focus on women, if the perspective gets broadened to include other discrimination areas. As Strasser has noted, the EWL has also raised criticism against the EU's adoption of equality mainstreaming, because of the little evidence of progression in gender equality (Strasser 2010: 7). The same is expressed by the representative from DAW:

"Diversity issues are very important, and I wouldn't negate that at all. But I'm not convinced that the way to make sure there is an inter linkage between gender and other factors of discrimination, is to try notice them in one thing. I really think that you have to take out gender equality because it's so overarched, so basic. It's the most basic, it influences you from the day you are born."

Our online survey showed that NGOs, more often than governmental institutions, were sceptical and had critical comments on diversity mainstreaming. Some NGO's raised doubts if politicians, and here they referred to male politicians, would turn to diversity perspectives and leave the gender aspect behind because of an idea of 'having done enough'. In this situation, diversity mainstreaming was framed as presenting a real danger for gender equality. One NGO saw diversity mainstreaming as a 'soft' approach, contrary to gender mainstreaming which often generated a strong negative impact on the employees. Diversity mainstreaming could thus be desirable for its potential positive impact. But still, they argued, in terms of efficacy for gender equality, diversity mainstreaming would not be efficient enough.

Our empirical material therefore reveals an awareness of the diversity aspect, but the perspective is mainly described as still in a learning process and is frequently met with scepticism. The restraint against putting diversity on the agenda, on the same lines as gender, is often due to a fear of losing sight of gender itself. This concern is also backed up by the findings of the research team focusing on multicultural citizenship in FEMCIT WP4.

From theory to practice – examples of implementation

Gender mainstreaming comprises both a theoretical approach and a strategy for practice. Moreover, it consists in an intention to integrate gender equality-oriented perspectives into mainstream thought and action. Mainstreaming gender in practice requires that the strategy is translated into concrete practice in policy creation, planning, and other programmes which affect people's lives. As we have previously elaborated, it seems that member states often seek to deal with this requirement by taking a bureaucratic approach to mainstreaming gender, e.g. by developing manuals, guidelines, toolkits etc. to guide the agents obligated to work with the strategy.

As described in the first part of this report, we understand gender mainstreaming as an interplay of discursive events. Until now, our examination of the implementation of gender mainstreaming has mainly focused on the discursive level. Now in this section, we wish to present examples of more concrete actions. By doing so, we move to the more descriptive part of our report. Our focus in the next section will be on a concrete tool that stems from the gender mainstreaming approach, namely gender budgeting. The focus on gender budgeting is chosen since it in particular has been highlighted as a fundamental tool for the institutionalisation of gender mainstreaming. The Beijing +15 report mentions gender budgeting as a sub-indicator for the second main objective of the Platform for Action's critical area of institutional mechanisms: gender mainstreaming. Likewise has EWL defined gender budgeting as an integral part of gender mainstreaming and of good governance, by referring to the obligation to integrate the gender dimension in all policy areas and the need for more

participation, transparency and accountability in policy making (EWL 2004: 10). In this context, gender budgeting can be seen as another means to gender-fair citizenship. Yet, first we will present a few critical concerns on the very notion of the development and use of tools as expressed before in the bureaucratic approach to gender mainstreaming.

Booth and Bennett have argued that two tasks are necessary for implementing gender mainstreaming: 1) An identification of elements of the strategy in user-friendly management terms, e.g. resources, time and organizational structures; and 2) An analysis describing contexts which can inspire, motivate and change systems within organisations (Booth and Bennett 2002: 431). They define gender mainstreaming as consisting of both a strategy to achieve equality and a set of methods and tools to implement that strategy. Meanwhile, they argue that the definition of the strategy has been weak; the development of tools has been more progressive. This, they argue, has meant that “mainstreaming gender equality has been interpreted as merely a new set of methods rather than a ‘transformative’ strategy” (Booth and Bennett 2002: 442). The same critique is raised by Squires, who criticises the expert-bureaucratic model of gender mainstreaming, arguing that the transformative potential of gender mainstreaming has been blurred by the focus on developing tools in specific policy contexts (Squires 2005).

There is certainly some truth in these critiques. But still, we will argue that the importance of development, and not at least the use of tools as an aspect of defining and formulating the strategy, should not be neglected. When we look at different EU member states, we see how gender mainstreaming has been made concrete in various forms and how guidelines, checklists and toolkits are centrally placed in the attempt to implement the strategy. As previously suggested, these actions should be seen to be just as central to the understanding of gender mainstreaming as the theory behind it. This also follows from our examination of national and European reports showing that gender mainstreaming tools are discussed, used and implemented to a rather large extent.

Because of the acknowledgement and importance given to the budgeting aspect of gender mainstreaming, we will elaborate this tool in more detail in the following section.

Gender budgeting

Budgets are often considered neutral, but are seldom actually neutral to gender differences. Therefore, gender mainstreaming budget processes aims to focus on the gender specific effects of budget-making and to identify discriminating factors against one gender (Council of Europe 2005: Gender budgeting). The need for gender awareness in budget-making was internationally acknowledged in the Beijing Platform for Action in 1995 where gender budgeting was introduced as an obligation for national governments. The obligation to gender mainstream public budgets meant that governments were

called to review and also change the distribution of public resources, so that women and men would benefit to the same extent. In article 346 the obligation was formulated like this:

“The primary responsibility for implementing the strategic objectives of the Platform for Action rests with Governments. To achieve these objectives, Governments should make efforts to systematically review how women benefit from public sector expenditures; adjust budgets to ensure equality of access to public sector expenditures, both for enhancing productive capacity and for meeting social needs; and achieve the gender-related commitments made in other United Nations summits and conferences.” (Beijing Platform for Action 2009: Chapter VI)

Also the women’s fund of the United Nations, UNIFEM, has pointed to gender budgeting as a commitment for national governments at all levels, stating that:

*“Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) is government planning, programming and budgeting that contributes to the advancement of gender equality and the fulfillment of women's rights.”*³⁹

At the EU level, the intergovernmental Steering Committee for Equality between Women and Men (CDEG) representing each of the 46 member states of the European Council, highlighted gender budgeting as a primary tool for successfully mainstreaming gender. The committee acknowledged how gender budgeting must involve all stages of governmental budget processes and go through all levels of government: national, regional and local.

In 2002, an informal group of experts on gender budgeting was formed with the goal to define the tool more specifically and to work up a methodology for implementation and examples of practice at local, regional and national levels. The group was given more formal authority in 2003 by the CDEG and became the Group of specialists on gender budgeting (EG-S-GB).

Several central equality agents have published information on gender budgeting. At the European level, EWL in 2004 published a report on gender budgeting, arguing that all public budget priorities influence the gap between the situation of women and men in society. The report invited women’s organisations to draw on their expertise in gender equality to influence governments and European institutions’ work on gender budgeting. Since these institutions are still in a starting phase as concerns actions on gender mainstreaming public budgets, EWL calls for a participatory aspect of women’s organisations to ensure the success of future actions on gender budgeting, i.e. *“[t]he direct involvement of women is crucial for such success.”* (EWL 2004: 15).

At the national level, several actions on gender budgeting have also found place, even though only four member states (Austria, Finland, France and Spain) make an explicit statement on their gender budgeting. As formulated by the Norwegian Ministry for Children and Equality, gender relevance in budget making must be defined through asking a range of questions, such as: *“Is the budget sector*

³⁹ <http://www.gender-budgets.org/>

person related? Will it affect the everyday lives of parts of the population? Are there differences between women and men in the sector with regards to rights, resources, participation/representation, values and norms that affect gender-specific behaviour?" The Ministry states that if one of these questions can be answered with a 'yes', the gender perspective is regarded relevant (Ministry of Children and Equality 2007: 7).

To give a more exact picture of what it means to gender mainstream budgets, in the following we will describe concrete actions on gender budgeting taken by five nation states: Austria, Germany, Poland, Spain and Norway. These examples will illustrate how gender mainstreaming has evolved in practice, between public institutional actions and initiatives from civil society (mainly women's organisations).

Austria

In 2001, Austria initiated gender budgeting by establishing a working group of economists and social scientists to collect knowledge, information and study the gender specific effect on the Austrian national budget. The aim was to integrate gender perspectives in budget policy decisions of all ministries. The Inter-Ministerial Working Group for Gender Budgeting (known as BEIGEWUM) formed a gender budgeting network of NGOs and ministries and convened jointly with the Inter-Ministerial Working Group for Gender Mainstreaming. In response to the demand for more assistance in the practice of gender budgeting, BEIGEWUM organised conferences and published results of their work (BEIGEWUM 2004).

In 2002, the Austrian government started gender budgeting by conducting a gender-disaggregated data analysis of Austrian income tax (BMF 2002). In 2004, the government decided to implement gender budgeting. And in the same year, the Ministry of Health and Women's Affairs established a gender budgeting working group. In 2005, the budget law incorporated gender budgeting as a tool of gender mainstreaming, which requested ministries to analyse the gender impacts of a certain category of their budget allocations (Council of Europe 2005: Gender budgeting).

Also in 2005, a technical conference "Development of a Strategy for Gender-Sensitive Budgeting" took place with the aim of kicking-off future cooperation in the implementation of gender budgeting at federal, provincial and community levels. The conference aimed to create a national network of all stakeholders operating in the field of gender budgeting. And in 2008, the federal government committed itself to gender-responsive budget planning and structuring, and to the use of the "Guidelines for Gender Mainstreaming in Law-Making" as well as the concept of "Working Aid for Gender Budgeting in the Public Administration". The "Working Aid for the Federal Finance Act" was given to all ministries and included a special section on "gender aspects of the budget". Moreover, practically-oriented supporting material was made to help ministries to structure and describe the

pilot projects they were required to carry out from 2009 onwards in accordance with uniform criteria.⁴⁰ A toolkit for gender budgeting was also devised.⁴¹

Gender budgeting was enshrined in the Federal Constitution in 2009. It was implemented in two phases, with the second phase taking effect in 2013 (UN 2009: REGIONAL REVIEW OF PROGRESS). These step by step pilot projects on gender budgeting are to be carried out by all ministries: The Federal Chancellery launched a project to integrate gender budgeting into the federal human resources plan of the central staff management tool. The main focus is on a fair distribution of top positions in federal services under income regulations between women and men. Furthermore, income distribution in line with gender equity is to be achieved, in addition to ongoing annual control for this purpose.

From 2009 and onwards, a part of the human resources plan concerns the gender specific tasks. Under this budget plan it should be possible to define quantifiable goals until 2013, goal attainment will be monitored year by year, and a final assessment will be made in 2013.⁴²

Germany

In 2002, the Heinrich-Boell-Foundation⁴³ in Germany organised a conference on “Gender Budgets, Financial Markets, and Financing for Development”.⁴⁴ The conference focused on three main areas: gender-sensible budgets; the role of the global financial markets and its gender dimensions; and financing for development. It aimed to come up with an alternative to the ‘present neoliberal economic models’ by showing insights from a feminist perspective. The conference was held with more than 150 registered participants.

In 2003, the German Federal Government’s inter-ministerial working group of experts on gender mainstreaming (IMA-GM) founded a sub-group on gender budgeting (UAG-GB). In 2005, the group initiated a feasibility study that ran from 2005 to 2006 on gender budgeting. Hereafter, several ministries used gender budgeting as a tool within their duty to mainstream gender perspectives in policies and planning. For example, the Ministry of Youth implemented a gender control of important budget titles, so that data on the participation of boys and girls in all actions were provided in yearly reports from the institutions funded by the ministry. Also the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of International Co-operation and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs have established gender budgeting instruments to control and restructure their expenditures. Moreover, several German states have implemented gender budgeting. For example, the state of Berlin established a Berlin commission on

⁴⁰ Response to the questionnaire on Implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

⁴¹ The toolkit can be accessed via the website: www.imag-gendermainstreaming.at

⁴² Response to the questionnaire on Implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.

⁴³ Heinrich-Boell-Foundation is a Green Think Tank and part of the Green political movement. Special attention of the Foundation is laid on sustainability, democracy, human rights with special emphasis on gender democracy. The Foundation describes itself as independent, also regarding the German Green Party. <http://www.boell.de/foundation/about-us-2188.html>.

⁴⁴ See <http://www.boell.de> and http://www.glow-boell.de/media/de/txt_rubrik_3/Young1Genderbudget.pdf

gender mainstreaming and a working group on gender budgeting, including the NGO 'Berlin Initiative for Gender-Just Budgeting'. The "Initiative for a Gender Sensitive Budget in Berlin" was founded in May 2001 after a workshop on Gender Budgeting organised by the NGO's Women's Forum. The goal of this initiative was to lobby for gender budgeting and to provide critical reflection on the ongoing implementation of gender budgeting in Berlin, for example through "shadow reports" on gender budgeting reports by the Berlin Senate. At the district level in Berlin, the focus for gender budgeting has been in areas such as libraries, sports, health care, children and youth.

On the local level, cities have introduced gender budgeting strategies into their budgets. For example, the district of Lichtenberg conducted a beneficiary-analysis and made the analysis a part of the budget. Information from the analysis is moreover used broader to make gender inequalities visible and to identify specific target groups. In Munich, a gender budget initiative was conducted with a demand to develop and implement gender budgeting for the city and to strengthen the citizens' active participation within the budgetary process.

Moreover, the Land Sachsen-Anhalt is conducting gender budgeting initiatives⁴⁵, and the women's organization Frauenforum has initiated work on gender budgeting⁴⁶ (Council of Europe 2005: Gender budgeting; EWL 2004: EU Gender Budgeting Overview; European Gender Budgeting Network 2006: Description of gender budgeting initiatives).

Poland

On the governmental level, Poland does not have remarkable initiatives on gender budgeting, but women's movements are actively working on implementing gender budgeting. In 2003, the Network of East-West Women (NEWW) and NEWW-Polska held a conference "Women and Economy", followed up by two days of training on gender budgeting for leaders of women's movements from more than ten countries. As a direct outcome of this conference, a Regional Network on Budget Initiatives and Gender (BIG) was launched. The year after, NEWW and NEWW-Polska organised another conference: "Gender Budgeting in East-Central Europe and countries of ex-Soviet Union". And another initiative was the Gdansk 'Gender Budget Initiative'⁴⁷: a pilot project on gender budgeting for local levels. The project cooperated with experts from other countries as well as the local Gdansk City Hall. Results and information from the initiative were disseminated in a publication, and several conferences and seminars were held afterwards (Council of Europe 2005: Gender budgeting; Katarzyna Bałandynowicz-Panfil, Urszula Opacka 2005: Gdańsk Gender Budget Initiative).⁴⁸

⁴⁵ See http://www.berlin.de/senwiarbfrau/frauen/gender_gs/budget.html and <http://www.sachsen-anhalt.de>

⁴⁶ See <http://www.nro-frauenforum.de/>

⁴⁷ See for example http://www.infopolis.es/web/GenderBudgets/pdf/GB_Poland.pdf

⁴⁸ See more at <http://www.neww.org>

Spain

The Spanish government also has few initiatives on gender budgeting, but some examples exist. The Spanish national Women's Institute⁴⁹ (Instituto de la Mujer) included a proposal for a study concerning the possibility of introducing some changes in the national budget to adopt a gender perspective in the Fourth Action Plan on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (2003-2006).⁵⁰ Also the Basque Country's Women's Office, Emakunde⁵¹, did a virtual library with materials on gender budgeting, and seminars were held.⁵² The Basque government's initiative the 'Gender Budget experience' was established by the Women's Institute to mainstream the gender perspective into budgets of public administrations. In 2001, a working group was established to implement gender budgeting in the Basque administration. In 2002, a pilot project with six Basque Government Departments was carried out and followed up by a conference with national and international experts in the field (Council of Europe 2005: Gender budgeting; EWL 2004: EU Gender Budgeting Overview).

Norway

The Norwegian Ministry of Children and Equality started to co-ordinate an initiative of gender budgeting in the Norwegian state budget in 2002. The initiative was defined as an attempt to prevent the possibility of "apparently gender-neutral policies and administrative decisions" upholding or reinforcing gender stereotypes.⁵³ All ministries were invited to participate in the programme, which led to almost all ministries initiating programmes themselves. In 2005, the gender budgeting process was reformed to improve quality and impact. The Norwegian Government intensified the process by defining guidelines to encourage all ministries to do gender equality assessments in their specialised budget areas. This was laid down in the Main Budget Circular from the Ministry of Finance, which also asked each ministry to conduct gender sensitive analysis of their budgets for new rounds of budget formulations. This meant that each ministry had a responsibility to define which policy sectors had to be subjected to a gender sensitive analysis.

In the state budget for 2006, all ministries were now requested to analyse the gender balances in their line budget propositions. New guidelines were prepared by an inter-ministerial working group assisted by external experts and a Gender Equality Annex was presented. External experts (including international expertise) were invited to assess the gender impact of some public programs and advise the national process of gender budgeting.

At local and regional levels, experts had been invited to organise training and education, documentation and evaluation of projects on gender budgeting; against this background guidelines for

⁴⁹ The Women's Institute is an autonomous body under the Ministry of Health, Social Policy and Equality and connected to the Ministry of Equality.

⁵⁰ See: <http://www.mtas.es/mujer/piom.htm>

⁵¹ Emakunde is the women's office of the Basque government.

⁵² See <http://www.infopolis.es/usuarios/bibliotec>

⁵³ Response Norway Beijing + 15 questionnaire p. 15.

future practice were developed. This resulted in several training seminars for ministries, country governors and agencies (Council of Europe 2005).

In 2007, the Ministry of Children and Equality published a Guide to gender equality assessments and discussion in ministry budget propositions (Ministry of Children and Equality 2007) in which gender budgeting is formulated as a duty for all ministries. The obligation to look at budget processes with gender lenses is based in the Norwegian Gender equality Act (Section 1 a), stating that gender equality should be reached through an active, targeted and systematic effort within all ministries: Initiatives and policies must not increase differences between men and women; they should reduce differences between men and women; and ministries must eventually analyse differential impact on men and women (Ministry of Children and Equality 2007: 6).

These concrete examples of gender mainstreaming initiatives, networks and projects show a more complex picture of gender mainstreaming than put forward in the two separated models presented initially. The actions taken on gender budgeting presents the participatory-democratic model, in the involvement of both governments and women's movements as promoters and initiators. And the bureaucratic and method-orientated model is represented by the very aim of the initiatives, namely the goal to provide a tool for thinking about gender equality in all stages of policymaking, a form of strategy-building and change in organisational routines.

Conclusion

To sum up this chapter and the previous, we suggest that gender and diversity mainstreaming could be seen as a means for a gender-fair citizenship. Even if gender mainstreaming has been criticised for lacking attention on other discrimination variables, there are attempts to include e.g. race and ethnicity: by theoretical approaches to gender mainstreaming already noted (see for example Crenshaw 1994; Hankivsky 2005: 993); but also within public institutions and NGOs.

In line with Bacchi and Eveline (2005), we argue that the question of perspective is also a matter of 'doing', i.e. of practices, processes and procedures in developing the strategies for equality. From this perspective, we have examined how agents relate to the concept of diversity mainstreaming. As pointed out in a FEMCIT presentation by Nyhagen Predelli one can ask if women's movements are a step behind the state in recognising the importance of intersectionality perspectives in achieving equality (FEMCIT paper for presentation Brussels 23. September 2010). Our empirical material shows that agents are positive towards a diversity perspective. But it also shows that they fear a backlash against gender equality as a result, or that they might find it difficult to integrate both perspectives in one.

Intersectional or diversity mainstreaming is meant as an approach where gender is kept as a vital but not as an *a priori* category. This includes a focus on how categories attain meaning through intersection with other categories (Hankivski 2005: 992, see also Søndergaard and Staunæs). As we have suggested in the first chapter, intersectionality might qualify the transformative idea of gender mainstreaming and strengthen a conceptualisation of more power dynamics. In the spirit of the broader frame of FEMCIT, we will emphasise the need for intersectional approaches to reach the goal of a gender-fair citizenship.

Gender mainstreaming as a means to a gender-fair citizenship is due to both the participatory model and the more expert-based tools used to measure whether policies and actions are fair to both women and men. The concept of fairness implies, as Threlfall argues, an acceptance of differences between women and men (Halsaa and Sümer 2010: 19). And, as Nyhagen Predelli points out, gender-fairness includes both women and men while excluding the notion of sameness (Halsaa and Sümer 2010: 20). This meets the criticism levelled against the notion of gender mainstreaming described in chapter one. Moreover, it is relevant to the concept of diversity mainstreaming, i.e. integrating notions of rights to diversity and non-discrimination.

Moreover, FEMCIT's discussion and definition of 'integration' can be elaborated in relation to gender mainstreaming, as it provides a rather adequate definition of how gender mainstreaming works, or ought to work, in practice: "Social integration refers to processes and efforts of making new elements fall into place within a society in such a way that the new element(s) become(s) a part of the system." (Halsaa and Sümer 2010: 11). FEMCIT goes further, and states that an integration of new elements of citizenship implies that forms of inclusion, participation and belongings are basically changed. In line with FEMCIT, we refer to Sabatier's (1987) notion of time frames for integrating new elements into established institutional practices. Sabatier suggests that three levels of integration can be identified, each with its own time frame. One level comprises technical and practical changes, with a time frame of four to five years. Another consists in altering the principles, strategies and aims of an organization, with a time frame of ten to fifteen years. And last, more fundamental changes in basic values and norms; these take at least twenty years to be implemented, since they require new persons and structures within the organization (Halsaa and Sümer 2010: 12). The strategy of gender mainstreaming can in many ways be placed on all three levels of integration.

We have only briefly touched the aspect of resources, even though it was mentioned by almost all interviewed persons. Researchers have highlighted resources as one of the important factors influencing the ability to put strategy into practice (Jahan, see Højlund Madsen 2010: 46). Booth and Bennett summarise the areas of importance for gender mainstreaming as the need for resources, voice and vision:

- Resources: funding for equality projects and the redistribution of resources to address disadvantage.
- Voice: address the democratic imbalance and secure an equal representation in decision-making.
- Vision: secure a sustainable relation between home, work and family life (Booth and Bennett 2002: 439).

As expressed by the representative from DAW: “We absolutely need more resources to be able to do a really good job”; and as also recognised by the UN (article 345): “Financial and human resources have generally been insufficient for the advancement of women” (Beijing Platform for Action 2009: Chapter VI)

As we have argued through the report, the lack of theory in gender mainstreaming is not necessarily the reason for barriers to implement the strategy. The picture is far more complex. We have shown that implementation does exist and that there are quite a few initiatives and programmes around Europe. Therefore, we will suggest that gender mainstreaming should not be seen as lost but rather as multiplied in translation.

In the following we shall explore gender mainstreaming as an important element in the staging and evaluation of the Platform for Action during the Beijing +15 events. The chapter will contextualise and focus on the communicative, transnational and mobilising aspects, departing from the notion of critical discourse analysis presented in chapter 1. We will apply a methodology that enables a broader scope of analytical attention and tools in the representation of gender mainstreaming. This includes an outline of how gender mainstreaming was launched in 1995, and its status in 2010 in the so-called Beijing +15 processes at global and European levels.

The chapter is based on the extensive reports provided by governments and regions, and supplemented by sociological observations made by one of the researchers (Hilda Rømer Christensen) during the Beijing +15 events in New York City in 2010. The observations of some of the main sessions and side events were recorded in written form and supplemented by extracts from the video archive of the formal CSW sessions.

The Beijing +15 events consisted in the following highlights:

- 1. The Beijing +15 NGO FORUM, New York City, February 27th – 28th 2010, convened by NGP/CSW New York. This forum formed a pre-conference for the meeting of the CSW (Commission on the Status of Women). It had an attendance of 1400 participants and was held in the impressive Salvation Army Center at 14th Street in Manhattan.*
- 2. The official CSW meeting, the 54th sessions, 1st-12th March 2010, held at the UN Head Quarters, UN Plaza in New York City (The Commission on the Status of Women 2010).*
- 3. The Beijing +15 NGO forum associated with the CSW meeting. Main and side events held in provisional buildings set up in the UN gardens, and in surrounding centers and hotels.*

If one takes into account the importance of international conferences and events in the making of feminist solidarities and politics, there is a striking lack of analysis that takes us beyond the focus of cognitive political and strategic issues. Moreover, there is a striking lack of elaborated analysis of the multiple means of communication applied by the women's movements and by international and regional organizations such as the UN and the EU. What is, e.g., the significance and grammar of the established UN and European level forms of talk and text, of speeches and reports? And what is the significance of emotional and symbolic forms of communication and mobilisation for the creation of joint hopes and shared visions in relation to the Beijing agenda and gender mainstreaming? However, it is beyond the scope of this report to make an elaborated cultural analysis of the events. Instead we shall briefly and spot-wise consider the significance of particular genres and voices in the making of such events.

The starting point will be the Beijing conference in 1995, which will be linked with the Beijing assessments in 2010. We will outline how the very idea of gender mainstreaming came about as a part of the impressive policy statement known as *The Beijing Platform for Action*. From here lines will be drawn to the Beijing +15 events in New York City in 2010.

From Beijing to New York – An Emotional and Political Journey

Gender mainstreaming was launched as part of the Beijing Platform for Action at the Beijing Conference in 1995. This boosted great hopes in the feminist and women's communities in many corners of the world. The Beijing NGO Forum was claimed to be the largest United Nations NGO forum ever, with 40.000-60.000 participants from all 189 UN countries. The substantial and diverse presence of women from all areas and cultures such as indigenous, rural, lesbian, disabled, old and young, produced a spirit of revolution and change. *Making Waves, Moving Mountains* was the optimistic title of an essay from 1996 that echoed the cutting edge and enthusiastic tune of the Beijing Conference (Chow 1996, Charlesworth 2006). Both at individual, collective and political levels the Beijing meeting changed lives, hopes and traditions of international meetings.

The Beijing Conference on Women and the associated NGO Forum was not a single affair, but formed part of intersecting historical process events of which the former UN women's conferences in Mexico 1995, Copenhagen 1980 and Nairobi 1985 made up the central axis.⁵⁴ In a retrospective perspective, the Beijing conference in 1995 was 'highly participatory' and marked by partnerships with NGOs and by horizontal communication and emotional involvement. It was said to demystify the idea of an international conference and differed from a 'grey suits atmosphere'. For people from the outside, not least the diplomats, the impression might even have been chaotic: the event mobilised across sectors and agents. It promoted the understanding of the state as responsible for promoting human rights as women's rights and for state allocated resources. Further, the idea of women's civil society as a symbol for the innovation of approaches was stressed.⁵⁵

Voices and speeches from 1995-2010

In 2010, memories of something outstanding were still strong among NGOs and activists who participated at the Beijing conference in 1995:

⁵⁴ Moreover the Beijing conference and the NGO Forum built on a range of more recent issue-based conferences, where gender and women's issues were present and integrated: the UN conference on children in 1990, on environment and development in 1992, on human rights in 1993, on population and development in 1994 and the World Summit for Social Development in 1995.

⁵⁵ Cf. *Patricia Licuanan* at the NGO Forum 27.2. 2010

“The world conferences on women changed and transformed my life and changed the women’s movement. It gave space and legitimacy.” (Charlotte Bunch, Senior Scholar, Rutgers University, Centre for Women’s Global Leadership).⁵⁶

“15 year after – I still have a hangover.” (Patricia Licuanan, President Mirium College, Philippines)

How can the cultural analysis of genres and speech be useful for the analysis and assessments of gender mainstreaming and the Beijing +15 as a communicative event? It is an old truth that politics – also feminist and women’s movement politics – is as much about feeling as it is about thinking. Emotion, it is claimed, has long been part of the very way in which politics and citizenship is constructed (Johnson 2010). Departing from here, it becomes vital to consider what kind of politics and feelings were at stake at events such as the Beijing and the Beijing +15 conferences and to consider what kind of emotional regimes they reflected.

A flash-back to the Beijing Conference in 1995 might provide some kind of impression of what was at stake. For instance, Gertrude Mongella, in her capacity as UN conference General Secretary, concluded the Beijing conference with an echo of its enthusiasm. In a convincing rhetorical style, she summarised the accomplishments:

“We have made it! We have managed to transcend historical and cultural complexities, we have managed to transcend socio-economic disparities and diversities, we have kept aflame our common vision and goal of equality, development and peace. In a number of areas we have significantly expanded the horizons of previous conferences. Finally, we have managed to achieve our consensus document – the Platform for Action – a task that was accomplished through the hard work and cooperative spirit, dedication and determination of governments and other groups represented here (...) We now have in our hands the mandates for which we have been working, our legitimate basis to demand change. Our platform, which represents a global consensus for social change, cannot now be hidden away and allowed to collect dust.”

(Statement by Gertrude Mongella: Secretary General of the Fourth World Conference on Women. Beijing 1995: 211-212)

In many ways Gertrude Mongella, as a strong and charismatic African Women, embodied the dream of diversity and unity of the global feminist movement as well as in the UN. In 1995, she was at the top of the UN organisation as general secretary of the Beijing Conference, In her speech she created a sense of a past, of a purpose and of continuity and voiced an almost religious ethos of hardship, getting from *“here to there”*. This forms a well-known stylistic reference to other great speeches, not least to the rhetoric of the civil rights campaigner Martin Luther King (Holmes 2009). But also in line with traditions of great rhetoric, the statement simultaneously persuaded by making references to

⁵⁶ Beijing + 15 NGO FORUM, New York City, February 27th, 2010 (pre-conference).

ephemeral feminist ideals such as change and unity, which she loosely contextualised to the realisation of the Beijing Platform and the hard work ahead:

“For, as our Chinese hosts say, the journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. The journey will not, however, be on super-highways on which we can gear up at full speed: it might rather take us over seas and lakes; over hills, mountains and valleys; it will take us many years of hard work and sacrifice to journey to the end. We may have to rest a little at rest stops when the going gets tough so that we can refuel, refresh and redirect ourselves. Social justice demands that we move on. Not even when we stray a little away from our course can we reverse the social revolution that has been launched.” (Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women. Beijing 1995: 213).

Mongellas oratory abilities and her command of the grammar and mobilising tunes of high political speech made her able to summarise and express hopes and visions for a receptive global audience. She was listened to and trusted by a global community of women, who felt mobilised and “reborn” through the Beijing attendance.

New and changed contexts can easily transform high rhetoric into insignificant pathos. This is a risk Mongella ran when she spoke at the NGO forum in New York City at the beginning of 2010, now with the formal title *President of the Pan-African Parliament*. She was back, perhaps more as an activist than as a high politician: she was humble, *“Oh you found me down in Africa”*; and she spoke with great enthusiasm and was acclaimed several times during her presentation, of which extracts are presented.

“This is now Beijing +15, but on your faces I see Beijing minus 15. The Beijing Platform kept us young and moved us to implement the platform. Thanks to all the women and men who did it. To those who are still alive, and those who are still among us. When preparing the Beijing meeting we saw that women belong to this planet. We are not asking for rights as a favour, we deserve the rights.

People have lost sight of those rights, also some women; we need to put issues back where they belong. I am fed up with corridor speak. I want to be at the microphone. If it is not now, when is it then? (laughter)

Certain opportunities have come up since 1995, but also lost opportunities. We have lost the opportunity for peace (...) the gun is still loud and clear in many parts of the world.

After 15 years, African girls enter a new phase of life, which is marked by rituals and accepted in another sphere of life. The Beijing platform is now 15 years and mature enough to produce children. Look at the documents, how mature has the world become with the platform that we all accepted in Beijing. We still have another 15 years to go.” (Gertrude Mongella, Tanzania, President of the Pan-African Parliament 2004 – present. Presentation at Beijing +15 NGO Forum 27.2. 2010).

The presentation here at the NGO forum can hardly be analyzed from the text alone, because it lacks the ways in which it was performed, with use of voice, body, tone and rhythm. It has been claimed that grand speeches are closer to singing and poetry than they are to cognitive discourse. In the

Mongella's case one might say that the speech was reminiscent of a secular gospel session, with a lively and responsive audience. Her diagnosis, after 15 years of disappointments and problems with the Beijing Platform, was still optimistic: *"the Beijing Platform kept us young and mature enough to produce children."*

At both official and side events at the Beijing +15, in her own original way Mongella exposed a twist of genres and representations; formal and informal, high and low politics were being blurred. This is a thought-provoking means of mobilisation, which might also contain new modes of (re)presenting female politicians and ways in which ongoing mobilisations for equality can be upheld and renewed. At a conceptual level, this indicates a departure and contestation of the claims of "representative talk" made by influential European intellectuals such as Carl Schmitt and Jurgen Habermas. Both have pointed to representative talk as beyond democracy and public policy modes. Carl Schmitt points to such talk as non-resonating, and as diction and music, referring to human dignity and hierarchy. It is a position that has been challenged by recent theories, which regard rhetorical expressions such as this to be a tool for emotional mobilisation of social movements and constituencies (Habermas 1968/1976. Johnson 2010).

Soft Governance at the UN level

It is well-known that the UN only has guiding and consultative status and not legislative power at any level. Accordingly, one way of pursuing the goals of the Beijing Platform has been through soft governance, substantiated in the 5 year reviews, where extensive written reports and oral presentations are monitored.

Review and evaluation of the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action has been carried out in 2000, 2005 and 2010. The latest review and appraisal of progress in 2010 also included the Outcome of the 23rd Special Session of the General Assembly (2000) and its contribution in shaping a gender perspective towards a full realisation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). It was carried out in March 2010 by the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and was also a part of CSW's fifty-fourth session. Further, the review and appraisal of progress was made in the context of the 15th anniversary of the adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Emphasis was placed on the sharing of experiences and good practices, with a view to overcome remaining obstacles and new challenges, including those related to the MDG's. UN Member States, representatives of non-governmental organizations and of UN entities participated in the session.

The regional commissions collaborate with the Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW) of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs in the review processes. A considerable part of the information builds on the regional review processes undertaken in all five regions by the UN regional commissions. These commissions include the preparation of regional review reports and the organisation of regional intergovernmental meetings. They prepare a common questionnaire to access

information from Governments on major achievements and remaining gaps and challenges in implementation at a national level. Member States are requested to provide information on efforts made and progress achieved since the most recent review and appraisal.⁵⁷

During the process all UN member states were obliged to submit reports and make a conference statement. The submission of material followed general procedures and was produced by governmental units, followed by presentations by cabinet ministers or their substitutes in the main hall of the conference. At the 54th Commission of the Status of Women, which formed the formal context of the Beijing +15 review, oral presentations of this sort took up the main part of the 14 day long programme. Most statements were read out in English, Spanish, or other main languages, from a prepared manuscript. After the inaugural and the special speeches and events, a slightly inattentive atmosphere arose in the UN conference hall, where the main role of the chairman became to call the audience, and not least the NGOs, to order.


Only few of the speakers took the opportunity to use this global podium to make significant points or claims. One exception was the Norwegian Minister for Equality, who made a spirited intervention for the cause of men and to mobilise men for gender equality⁵⁸. Another distinct presentation was made by Vivienne Reading, the current EU Commissioner for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship. Her focus was on gender based violence and she announced several new initiatives to curb the problem⁵⁹.

In our explorations of the written reports from EU member states, we found their usefulness limited, in the sense that they are very uneven in length and in their focus. Moreover the few, but critical, shadow reports at European levels, e.g. from Denmark and Austria, reveal the lack of transparency and democratic control of this genre of reporting. Hence in the Danish Governmental report to the Beijing +15, it was optimistically reported that gender mainstreaming had generated 19 ministries for gender equality instead of one. This optimistic rhetoric was, however, criticised in the shadow report from the *Women's Council in Denmark*, who complained about the lack of exact goals and institutional implementation, and insufficient funding as impediments to the implementation of gender mainstreaming in Denmark (Women's Council in Denmark 2009).

The former director of the Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW), Carolyn Hannan, recognises these problems, but considers the reports as important for the progress of gender mainstreaming:

⁵⁷ <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing15/index.html>

⁵⁸ All formal sessions were videotaped and are accessible on the internet.

⁵⁹  Webcast archived video [[Original language](#) | [English](#)] Monday 1 March 2010, 3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m. <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing15/index.html>

“Another good thing in the commission is that you do have these national statements, which I think are quite interesting. We know that countries come and tell you the good things and there is no way to verifying if its completely fact, but you do get an overview of what countries are trying to do, and what you are reporting is important to them. So you find that in all countries, in all regions people are working on gender mainstreaming.” (Hannan interview, June 2009)

From our point of view – and from the point of view of the *Beijing Platform for Action* as a communicative action – there is a pressing need to widen the scope and to make a mobilising and participatory effort. There is an urgent need for including critical and diverse voices in gender mainstreaming reporting systems, both at status report levels and in relation to other important reporting systems, an example being CEDAW (*The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*).⁶⁰ Governmental units have expanded and been consolidated over the last two decades, due to e.g. the requirements of gender mainstreaming. This means that women NGOs might now have weaker representation in decision making and reporting systems. Therefore, it is vital to secure the critical and diverse voices of women’s movements and civil society in future reporting mechanisms, which require both mandates, knowledge and resources.

The Making of Gender Mainstreaming

Gender mainstreaming was launched at the Beijing conference as a new and holistic way of policymaking. It was rhetorically woven into the impressive and all-encompassing Platform for Action: a huge policy document that presented 12 critical areas of concern where future actions should be taken in order to empower women and accomplish equality and justice. As such, gender mainstreaming was also part of the entire package of hope and enthusiasm spurred by the conference.

Gender mainstreaming was coined as follows in the Beijing Declaration, September 1995:

*“We hereby adopt and commit ourselves as Governments to implement the following Platform for Action, **ensuring that a gender perspective is reflected in all our policies and programmes.** We urge the United Nations system, regional and international financial institutions, other relevant regional and international institutions and all women and men, as well as non-governmental organizations, with full respect for their autonomy, and all sectors of civil society, in cooperation with Governments, to fully commit themselves and contribute to the implementation of this Platform for Action.”* (Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing Declaration, September 1995: 5, par 38)

In a historical perspective, the idea of applying mainstreaming in relation to gender equality arose in development communities under the rubric of “*Gender and Development*” from whence it diffused into

⁶⁰ A similar call has been made in Halsaa and Thun 2010.

the global institutional discourses during the 1980s.⁶¹ For instance, the *Nairobi Forward Looking Strategy for the Advancement of Women* called for the effective participation of women in development to be integrated into the formulation and implementation of mainstream programmes and projects. (*Nairobi Forward Looking Strategy for the Advancement of Women* 2006). In the negotiations prior to the Beijing conference in 1995, there were lively exchanges of views and ideas regarding the notion of gender mainstreaming. Here four cross-cutting areas of attention were suggested as: 1) Empowerment of women; 2) Full and equal partnership between women and men; 3) Mainstreaming of women in the development process, as agents as well as beneficiaries; and 4) Diversity of women and their situations (Proposals for Consideration in the Preparation of a Draft Declaration 1995: 2). Moreover, the Beijing agenda focused on the communicative form and accessibility: the proposed declaration was meant to reach parliamentarians and rural women alike; it was suggested to make it short and concise as well as *“rousing and inspiring”*.

It is interesting that the EU submitted a proposal which extended and focused the meaning of mainstreaming to cover all political areas in all parts of the world, spelled out as follows: *“Integration of the question of the relationship between the sexes in all programmes and politics”*. Yet the EU position on the other cross-cutting areas seemed more moderate than the manifesto language suggested by the UN general secretary. Instead of *“full and equal partnership between men and women”*, the EU suggested *“reconciliation of family and professional life for women and men”* and *“encouragement of women and men to work together for equality”* (Proposals for Consideration in the Preparation of a Draft Declaration 1995: 4). Meanwhile Canada, as one of the outspoken and experienced members of the preparation committee proposed that *“equal rights, equal sharing of responsibilities and opportunities in all aspects of life and harmonious partnership between women and men are critical to the well-being of humanity”* (Proposals for Consideration in the Preparation of a Draft Declaration 1995: 1-2).

The Beijing Platform for Action was in itself a huge and detailed document that contained both old and new areas of concern for feminist activism and gender equality in the eastern, western, northern and southern parts of the world. The priority areas included twelve themes, all of which were elaborated in detailed strategic objectives and actions in the over 100 page long document: A) Women and Poverty; B) Education and Training of Women; C) Women and Health; D) Violence against Women; E) Women and Armed Conflict; F) Women and the Economy; G) Women and Power in Decision-making; H) Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancements of Women; I) Human Rights of Women; J) Women and the Media; K) Women and the Environment; and L) The Girl Child (Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women. Beijing 4-15 September 1995. New York 1996).

⁶¹ From a FEMCIT perspective of intersectional analysis, it is striking that the idea of mainstreaming had been around in other areas since the 1970s, where it was suggested as a methodology capable of including students with diverse backgrounds e.g. in relation to race and disability.

While the terminology switched from women to gender in the overall political approach, the term 'women' was maintained in the political priorities of the Beijing Platform. It is interesting that the need for cooperation and participation of NGOs and grassroots organisations was seen as vital through the entire document. The need for transparency and for connecting to and co-operation with networks and organisations was underlined at several occasions, as well as the need for clear objectives and accountability mechanisms: *"Links with other institutions at the national, sub regional/regional and international levels and with networks and organizations devoted to the advancement of women are needed"* (Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action 1995: 119). Non-governmental and grassroots organisations had a specific role to play in the creation of a social, economic, political and intellectual climate based on equality between women and men. Women should be actively involved and it was underlined that an effective implementation of the Platform implied that all organisations should *"promote an active and visible policy of mainstreaming a gender perspective, inter alia, in the monitoring and evaluation of all policies and programmes"* (Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action 1995: 119).

Criticism has abounded during the process of implementation and analysis, both at theoretical and practical levels, regarding the absent or even negative effects of gender mainstreaming. One quite common criticism runs as follows: that the strategy of gender mainstreaming at the UN level *"has deployed the idea of gender in a very limited way and has allowed the mainstream to tame and de-radicalize claims to equality"* (Charlesworth 2006). However, at the organisational and practical UN level, the gender mainstreaming strategy is maintained as important, and indeed as the best. According to the former DAW director, Carolyn Hannan, gender mainstreaming still holds unrealised potential. Moreover, she sees the problems related to gender mainstreaming as embedded in more all-encompassing power relations:

"Gender mainstreaming is a rather tedious job that takes a long time. It's not that exciting for the press. That's why many of the politicians don't like it. For me it's the only way forward to systematically make sure that gender perspectives are understood. (...) For me, gender mainstreaming is a really critical strategy because you need it and it's the only way. Sometimes people say to me, why gender mainstreaming is dead and why do we have to do the gender mainstreaming, it doesn't work. And I always say it has never been implemented anywhere that I know, effectively. It's the implementation that we are lacking. We shouldn't throw out the strategy. We should look at how we do it. If you ask people, what is the alternative, do we want to go back to special projects for women, and it is not because we don't want separate development for women. We want development for both women and men, with women and men having equal opportunities to influence it and participating (in) it." (Interview Hannan June 2009)

In Hannan's view, which also presents a powerful view in the UN system, gender mainstreaming is seen as a long-term strategy with an ideal goal that is being continually undermined by short-term implementations, evaluation strategies, and politicians who are out for new political projects and new terminologies with quick outcomes.

Beijing Platform at a Cross Road?

While the Beijing Conference in 1995 was recalled as being rich on joint mobilisation and cultural expression, things were different in New York 2010. And this made the expression of a collective *hangover* seem appropriate. In 2010, the global situation had changed and multiplied old problems and challenges in all fields: growing fundamentalism; conservative back lash in governments with a preference for traditional NGOs; the unstable and shrinking influence of the UN; climate change and the battle to combat the consequences; negative and gendered globalization from above and from below; neoliberal politics and interventions, widening the gap between rich and poor, and between men and women.

The perception throughout the panels and talks at the NGO forum in 2010 was that the cause of gender equality and international feminism had then reached a crisis point, due to both endogenous and exogenous factors. Mantras like *"we have the documents, but not sufficient resources to implement"* or *"walk the talk"* were repeated over and over again, indicating that in spite of much talk and many texts, the efforts had spurred little or no felt effects.

The lack of progress in the broad participatory processes suggested in the Platform for Action became visible in a statement issued by a cluster of women's organizations and NGOs. They found that their commitments and loyalty towards the Beijing Platform had not paid off:

"Women's organizations have been the driving force behind the Beijing process. We note the Secretary Generals repeated emphasis on the importance of civil society to the work of the UN, particularly in relation to the achievement of women's rights. As representatives of such organizations we are deeply concerned that the spaces for influencing decision making by women's organizations at the Beijing+15 review have been significantly reduced." (Final Statement. Concerning Beijing +15 process Review at Commission on the Status of Women. March 4th, 2010)

In particular, this criticism addressed the final declaration emerging from the CSW meeting in conclusion of the Beijing +15 review process. The declaration was a brief statement that had (according to the women's movements) been agreed on ahead of time and adopted without consultation with civil society. This was compounded with the absence of information on opportunities to influence the conduct and outcome of the CSW meeting and declaration. And last but no least, there were the poor logistics and facilities that had prevented women from participating effectively in the conference. The signing group of women's associations also made the claim that

women's movements during the meeting were used to legitimate an empty declaration that did not deal substantially with the challenges that had come up since 1995: "*In its failure to strongly reaffirm and commit to renewed and concrete actions and recourses to implement BBPFA, the Declaration represents a backward step*". Hence the Beijing +15 review reveals an array of tensions: both among those working within and outside of women's organisations; and between those working within and outside the UN as an organisation.

From the inside of the UN unit on Development and Women (DAW) and the CSW secretariat, things looked different and were seen in a broader and more strategic perspective, summarised by Carolyn Hannan. Here she explains why the Beijing Platform has not been re-negotiated since 1995 as a pragmatic strategic move against the conservative and religious turn in many of the UN member-states:

"So people realize that in the UN, among the NGOs and also the member states, that in the political context we were in, it was quite a dangerous strategy to open up negotiation. When we came to 2005 there were some NGOs that were pushing for another conference. But basically people in the UN and most of the member states were fully aware that we would have taken the risk undermining the platform for action rather than complementing it. (...) Since 1995 we haven't been in a political position, where we can say for sure, that we will move forward." (Interview Hannan, June 2009)

As we will show in the following, the influential European Womens's Lobby (EWL) and other European gender based organisations, e.g. ILGA, hold opinions on the review process and on the Platform that are in line with the official UN line.⁶²

Carolyn Hannan extended the arguments in favour of continuing the Beijing Platform in its original form and for not having a big conference in 2010 or in the near future for that sake: "*Now in the 15-year review, it will not be a conference, it will be a similar process to what we had in 2005, a short declaration*". This is, she argues in line with the general trends of the UN working methods: "*The thing is also that the commission has always been focused on policy development and now it's moving more into line with the general UN focus implementation. The commission is more focused on its role as a catalyst for implementation at national network. So there is a much stronger focus today not on just negotiating, they don't sit two weeks and negotiate documents. They want to have more chance to come together and discuss*" (Interview Hannan June 2009).

As such, it looks as if the CSW and the UN/DAW administration have tried to make a pragmatic conjunction of the dilemmas and the critical positions from both outside and inside. The vital space of consensus, a guiding principle of operation in the UN and the CSW, was extended with the 1995 Beijing

⁶² This opinion seemed to be shared by e.g. the Danish Government and major stakeholders, such as The Council of Women in Denmark and others cf. FEMCIT meeting with end users, Minister for Equality and University of Copenhagen, January 2010.

Platform meeting but seems to have been shrinking and challenged ever since. As such the CSW and the associated UN agencies can be seen as caught between a growing number of Conservative UN member states and women's organizations who want to re-negotiate the Platform, in order to modify critical areas or even do away with it. On the other hand, there are the liberal and more radical women's organizations that feel disappointed and betrayed. They require a reaffirmation and reinforcement of the BPfA as a "*comprehensive, critical and human rights framework that requires full implementation as a matter of urgency and as integral to and prerequisite for the implementation of the MDGs*" (The UN Millennium Development Goals). They also urge for more participatory procedures and for adequate funding at all levels (Association for Women's Rights in Development 2010).

In spite of political uncertainties and grumbling NGOs, there was at least one clear success emergent from the Beijing +15 events. *The Gender Equality Architecture Reform* (GEIR) campaign, which was pursued by an international coalition of over 300 NGOs, mostly comprising of women's rights activists, affectively pushed for a Gender Equality Architecture Reform in the UN system. The GEIR action even became a symbol of the UN as still open for activist NGOs: Activists hung a GEAR UP Banner from the balcony during the speech of the UN General Secretary on International Women's Day in 2010. In September 2010, the UN general assembly supported the reform proposal of a better resourced and reformed UN organisation to promote women's empowerment. They created a new unit, dubbed *UN Women*,⁶³ as a result of lengthy discussions over making a shift from women to gender in the name. *UN Women* forms an amalgam of four other UN bodies and agencies: the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM); the Division for Advancement of Women (DAW); the OFFICE and Special Advisor on Gender Issues; and the UN International Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW). The new unit is set to have a budget on 500 mill. US dollars, doubling the current resources of the four units comprised.

It is striking for the expansion of transatlantic and global exchanges that the European Women's Lobby explicitly supported the reform of UN gender related agencies in their Beijing review *From Brussels to Beijing*. This also links to one of the successful but ambivalent outcomes of the Beijing Process: that the governmental units have expanded and been consolidated over the last two decades, due to e.g. the requirements of gender mainstreaming. This is a situation which might carry both negative and positive implications for the relative power position and resources of NGOs vis-à-vis state machinery. This power position also becomes visible in the fact that women's NGOs have a much weaker representation in the available material and reporting systems, compared to the bureaucracies themselves.

⁶³ *UN Women. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.*

As mentioned earlier, we find that both institutional and mobilising strategies need to be advanced in order to realise the potential and vision introduced at the Beijing Conference.⁶⁴ This holds especially true of the current situation, where values, feelings and power positions are changing at both global and European levels. Values, and the relatively strong power position of gender equality, are under challenged due to the new composition of EU member states.

“It’s a completely different world in one respect, but it doesn’t take away some of the other problems that we had. The other thing is, if you look at the European Union, for example in the UN, we have been able to rely on the European Union for years (...)but today in some contexts, the European Union doesn’t really have a position. (...) Let’s say, that we are going to have a negotiation on sexual reproductive rights, do we want 15 years after Beijing to have a weaker document than we had in Beijing? That would be a disaster.” (Hannan interview 2009)

The lack of a joint EU position at global levels on reproductive rights derives from the fact that several of the new EU member states dissent on e.g. reproductive rights, access to abortion and sexual preferences. Here they share the opinions of certain Muslim countries, who already made their reservations to such provisions clear in 1995. All of which makes the negotiation and endorsement of the Beijing Declaration critical in the longer perspectives (Beijing 1995 Report).

From Beijing to Brussels: The European Women’s Lobby and the Beijing Reviews

In the following, we shall return to the two models of gender mainstreaming and the alleged tensions involved in defining gender mainstreaming and among agents with different visions. Should gender mainstreaming primarily consist in the provision of a comprehensive set of toolkits carried out by normal policy agents and civil servants? Or should gender mainstreaming primarily be a political process, in which women’s participation and gender issues are mobilised and guaranteed a voice in policymaking? In the following, we will critically explore Judith Squires’ two-pronged model in relation to institutional and women’s movement discourses, i.e. expanding the analysis in chapter 3.

Departing from the Beijing conference and the Beijing +15 events at the level of the United Nations, we shall look at the strategy and contribution of the European Women’s Lobby towards gender mainstreaming and the Beijing platform. Does the EWL qualify as an organisation of deliberation in the sense of Squires’ model? And how does the EWL fare as a powerful European organisation in

⁶⁴ The lack of mobilised energies and of broader intersectional perspectives was confirmed at the European Beijing + 15, Regional Review Meeting, Geneva 2-3, 2009, convened by the Economic Commission for Europe. This is with the exception of certain Eastern/non-EU member states who underlined the different gender structures in their contexts. For instance the idea of gender equality as “gender balance” does not make sense in their context, due to the fact that many men are worse off than women.

European equality politics when it comes to mobilising space for subaltern and non-hegemonic counter-publics (Verloo 2005)? How have tensions between bureaucratic and mobilisation strategies in gender mainstreaming been negotiated by the EWL? Did EWL interventions widen and relocate the idea of gender mainstreaming and the space for feminist pressure and transformations?

The idea of a European Women's Lobby was framed and found support in the EU at the end of the 1980s since it was in need of appropriate tools and communities who could bridge the gap between the European institutions and the citizen's interests. As such, the history of the European Women's Lobby is closely connected to the EU. The EWL was established in 1990 after pressure from 12 national co-ordinations of women's movements from contemporaneous EU member states: Belgium; Denmark; France; Germany; Greece; Ireland; Italy; Luxembourg; Portugal; Spain; The Netherlands; and the UK. Furthermore, 17 large European women's organisations supported the idea. EWL membership has increased in concomitance with EU expansion; in 2010, the EWL counts 2500 member organisations, consisting of co-ordinations from all 27 EU member states, three accession countries and 21 euro wide and international women's organisations. The very name of the new co-ordinating body, *The European Women's Lobby*, accentuated close ties to the EU, as did its financial structure. From the outset, the core budget of the EWL has been dependent on EU contributions. In 2010, 80 % of the budget has been received as an operating grant based on a working programme from the European Commission, while the other 20 % has been provided from other sources. However, the EWL budget has not been raised during the last decade in spite of a growing membership. Instead the EWL has to compete with similar NGOs for scarce and short-term project funding from the EU and other sources (Beijing + 10. November 2004: 4 and interview with EWL, January 2010).

In conceptual terms, the creation of the EWL was tied to the construction of a new form of interaction between citizens, political officials and the mobilising opportunities offered by the EU (Hafner-Burton 2000). The aims of the EWL, as presented at the current EWL website, echo the dual track conception of gender mainstreaming as including emphasis on both a gender dimension and on women's participation. The EWL's purposes are:

1. To lobby the European institutions and to provide information to decision-makers to ensure *“that women's rights and needs as well as a gender perspective, are taken into account in the preparation of politics and legislation.”*⁶⁵
2. To promote the participation of women's organisations at the EU level and provide them with the information they need to do so.⁶⁶

The EWL further presents itself as a democratic organisation with transparent procedures of communication, decision-making and accountability.⁶⁷ The full membership meets each year to decide

⁶⁵ EWL history: <http://www.womenlobby.org/spip.php?rubrique43&lang=en>

⁶⁶ EWL history: [www.http://www.womenlobby.org/?lang=en](http://www.womenlobby.org/?lang=en)

on policy priorities and to agree on a work programme. The secretariat of 10 staff members is based in Brussels. Due to its multiple positions in both the landscape of women's movements and in the institutional structure of the EU, the EWL could be labelled as an "outsider within". *Outsider* in the sense that the EWL, in line with its many members organisations, deals with a contested and unstable field of EU politics, but *within* in the sense that the EWL has a close and unique relationship with the institutional power centres of European equality policies.

The EWL and the Beijing + processes

The Beijing + processes constitute a suitable context for assessing the issue of gender mainstreaming as a dynamic process of communication, rather than in fixed terms and notions. In any case, the EWL reviews of the Beijing process are a substantiation of how a major European Women's organisation has negotiated and actively contributed to the staging of the current notion of gender mainstreaming.

In the following we will focus on how the EWL discourse of gender mainstreaming has been spelled out in the Beijing + processes over the last 15 year. In doing so, we shall present a selected cross reading of the EWL review and reports, and outline the discourse of gender mainstreaming in the context of broader socio-political contexts and the change of equality strategies, focused on the following questions:

- Has the EWL position changed over time in accordance with the new political context and challenges at European and global levels?
- Did the EWL widen the idea of gender mainstreaming and the space for feminist pressure and transformations?
- What is the EWL position on the emerging field of multiple discrimination and intersectional politics?

The EWL Beijing reviews

The EWL was present as an active participant at the Beijing Conference in 1995 and has played a vital role for the subsequent evaluation process at the European level. Moreover, the EWL has provided extensive reports in response to global evaluation processes. These reports are based on contributions and discussion with EWL members and other organisations, and they include the following:

⁶⁷ The very terminology of 'lobby' and 'lobbying' has, in general, been negatively associated with powerful financial and corporate groups who manipulate the democratic political process in their own interests. From a Danish critical position, the very word and idea of a women's lobby in the context of the EU was seen as somehow detrimental during the 1990s, while the Lobby today (as among earlier sceptics) is respected as a vital feminist platform at the European level.

- *Beijing + 5. Regional alternative report for the European Union. Presented by the European Women's Lobby.* May 2000
- *Beijing + 10: 1995-2005: Review of the Implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action by the European Union. Report by the European Women's Lobby.* November 2004
- *Beijing + 15: From Beijing to Brussels. An Unfinished Journey. The European Women's Lobby. Beijing + 15 Report on the Activities of the European Union.* Brussels, February 2010

The reports follow a common structure focused on:

1. Progress, action taken, good practice.
2. Extant barriers: Analysis of the situation of women in the area concerned; and, in later reports, broader economic and social contexts.
3. Conclusions and EWL recommendations.

The very form of each of the three reports demonstrates both the growing professionalism of the EWL and the rising importance of the Beijing reviews as a vital part of the overall EWL strategy. While the Beijing + 5 report was presented in a rather roughly drafted version meant for internal European and global procedures, the last report *From Beijing to Brussels. An unfinished Journey* consisted in a well laid out booklet with thoroughly knowledge based assessments and recommendations. The EWL report was launched at a well attended side event at the CSW NGO forum in New York City in March 2010 that attracted a wider European and global public.

It is thought-provoking that the EU has only gradually participated in the formal reporting of the Beijing + 15 processes in visible and accessible ways.⁶⁸ European contributions to the Beijing Process have mainly been coordinated within the framework of the UN Economic Council of Europe (UNECE). This process has taken the form of regional conferences followed by short regional reports aimed at the DAW report collection.⁶⁹ Yet in 2010 an effort was made by the Swedish Presidency in relation to the Beijing + 15 process. The Presidency presented a comprehensive report that pinpointed progress made, and identified remaining obstacles and challenges in the EU. The report was made on the basis of information provided by and consultations with the EU member states. It was "taken note of" by the

⁶⁸ However the EU has made parallel internal follow ups on the Beijing Processes: In 1995 the Madrid European Council requested an annual review of the implementation in the Member States of the Beijing Platform for Action. And since 1999 sets of quantitative and qualitative indicators have been developed by subsequent presidencies, but so far they only cover 9 of the 12 critical areas of concern in the Platform. In both the 10 and 15 years review of the Beijing Platform for Action, the EU ministers for gender equality adopted conclusions which supported and reaffirmed EU commitments to gender equality and the Beijing Platform for Action. See *Council Conclusions on the review of the implementation by the Member States and the EU institutions of the Beijing Platform for Action. Beijing + 15 Review Progress.* Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council Meeting Brussels 30 November 2009.

⁶⁹ See review report for Europe: ECE/AC.28/2009/3 Regional review of progress: Regional synthesis.

EU Council in 2009, but the report was not submitted on behalf of the EU as such (Beijing + 15. The Platform for Action and the European Union 2009).

The extensive EWL review of the Beijing process has been a way of mobilising multiple and “critical” voices and perspectives at EU and global levels. Hence the Beijing + processes have become a stepping-stone for “inner” mobilisations of the EWL membership and other partners at the European levels, and they serve the same function in proliferating European positions and claims in the global processes of gender equality:

“...the revision process of the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action is also an opportunity for activists and women’s NGOs to network, to share good practices and to raise critical voices on the global scene. It is also an opportunity to ask our governments, as well as European and international organisations for a renewed commitment and for stronger accountability mechanisms in order to make progress towards the full implementation of women’s human rights. In this context, it will be crucial for the future of the European Union and for the building of a truly democratic space in Europe, for these voices to be heard.” (EWL Beijing + 10: 10)

As such, the Beijing Reviews of the EWL can also be seen as a channel for critical voices to be heard and even to become part of the broader EU soft governance processes in a more critical staging of gender equality and human rights.

The EWL and the Beijing + 5 Review

The activist and spirited tune of the Beijing conference was still felt in the EWL report associated with the Beijing +5 review in the year 2000. The report made clear the central role of the EWL as co-ordinating the assumed critical contributions of European level NGOs to the overall UN 5 year review. The title of the report itself already created a distance from the (lack of) official reports, labelled as a regional “*alternative* report in view of the UN General Assembly’s special session for the five-year-review of the Beijing Platform for Action.” As stated by the EWL, the report was based on the “enormous task” of evaluating the national reports, which the EWL had assumed the responsibility of gathering and co-ordinating. The initial presentation was made at the regional UNECE meeting in Geneva in January 2000.

The EWL deeply regretted the narrow focus of the official ECE which had only taken four themes of the platform into account. “*The EWL insists that the five-year review covers all 12 areas of concern and the negotiations on the commitments made in the BPfA should not be re-opened in any case*”. This meant that if and when the Beijing Platform was opened up for renegotiations it should be not be scaled down from the 1995 commitments.

At the overall level the EWL on behalf of major women's organisations in Europe noted general progress in the field, saying that gender equality had been "recognised as an issue for society as a whole, and not only as a "women's issue". Also the EWL welcomed the affirmation of the principle of gender mainstreaming especially in the *Treaty of Amsterdam*. At the same time, the EWL stressed that gender mainstreaming "*has to be accompanied by specific measures for women*" and warned against the use of a *gender dimension* as a threat.

In the eyes of the EWL, the potential for abuse and distortion of the concept of gender mainstreaming had already been demonstrated when the *Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunity* was called into question in 1998 by "a few" MEPs, who argued that its existence promoted the marginalisation of equal opportunities policy and was counterproductive to the principle of gender mainstreaming. On this ground, the Parliament had discussed the substitution of the committee with what the EWL saw to be an "*insignificant task force*". This case was seen as a clear message to the women of Europe: "*that in the future European policy would no longer take them into account*" (EWL/Beijing + 5: 13). The EWL resisted and organised a successful campaign, with the effect that the committee was continued.

Throughout the Beijing + 5 report the EWL ventured for the dual track approach and the need for women-specific actions and programmes. With respect to institutional mechanisms for the advancement of women the EWL came up with demands that addressed both gender mainstreaming and positive action, and measures that could bridge and strengthen both. According to the EWL, the progress that had been made since September 1995 was hampered by the lack of available and clear benchmarks. Accordingly, the EWL made a plea for establishing "*common criteria and benchmarks in order to hold governments accountable*".

The demands listed by the EWL addressed both institutional and political mechanisms as well as equality provisions related to the 12 critical areas of the Beijing Platform (EWL Beijing + 5: 15-16). It is worth noting that the EWL was optimistic about the future possibilities of revising and advancing the Beijing Platform of Action. The EWL even expressed this in a request for a new UN Women's World Conference to be held in 2005. This new world conference was conceived not so much as a site of mobilisations, but more as an opportunity for advancing what could be seen as the bureaucratic tools of gender mainstreaming:

"The EWL stresses the absolute necessity for a new World Conference on Women in 2005 and for the monitoring/evaluation of tools, gender disaggregated statistics, benchmarking, time bound targets, for equality policies to be truly effective." (EWL Beijing +5: 5)

Overall, the Beijing + 5 report of the EWL at the level was optimistic yet aggressive, providing a check list for advancing the Beijing Platform and the double track of gender mainstreaming. It also reflected the outlook of gender equality politics, and the opposition between gender mainstreaming and

positive action. It is striking that the concerns of the later reports were broader, addressing changes of the overall political, economic and cultural contexts of the EU at global scales, as well as a different position on gender mainstreaming.

The EWL and the Beijing + 10 Review

The tune of the EWL Beijing + 10 report in 2005 was far more professional and pragmatic, echoing the contemporary changes in the EU and their impact on gender equality. *“Those changes sometimes bring hope for women’s rights, but they also represent challenges”* (EWL Beijing + 10: Executive Summary: 6.).

At this time, even more than in the year 2000, the Beijing Platform for Action was regarded as a *“major milestone”* in the struggle for equality between women and men globally. Since Beijing, some *“real progress”* had been made in the European Union: at both a legislative level and regarding women in decision making. Also, there had been a growing focus on violence against women, which was seen as an achievement of the women’s NGOs: *“... thanks to the action of women’s NGO’s there has been a growing awareness about questions related to violence against women”* (EWL Beijing + 10: 6).

In the EWL’s view, these challenges were presented by the macro-economic developments of the EU. The increased stress on market liberalisation, privatisation and competition, did not include and relate to social agendas, and gender equality in particular. Also during this period, a widespread reduction of funding for public services had been induced, to the disproportionate disadvantage of women. According to the EWL, this had led to greater feminisation of poverty in the EU, less job security and the weakening of the European social model of social protection and social service (EWL Beijing + 10: 6). The neo-liberal economic politics had impeded the progress and consolidation of gender equality and fundamental rights, hampering the European social model:

“The global trend towards and the wide spread support for neo-liberal economic policies, has also limited the scope for action both for individual member states and the EU itself to put a stronger focus on the concrete enjoyment of fundamental rights in particular social rights and women’s rights.” (EWL Beijing + 10: 6)

The EU’s enlargement in 2004 and the inclusion of ten new Central and Eastern European countries represented a challenge. It was seen by the EWL as a *“major turning point”* with mixed outcomes. The legitimate expectation of many women in these countries was that EU membership and the transposition of EU gender equality laws would contribute to greater gender equality and provide women with new opportunities. This expectation, however, had been negated by the economic preconditions for accession, with negative impacts on women’s material and social lives. Also, as a negative side effect, trafficking in women for the purpose of sexual exploitation had increased (EWL Beijing + 10: 7).

Another disturbing trend mentioned by the EWL was the harmful influence of highly conservative forces and religious fundamentalism, in particular in relation women's sexual and reproductive rights. Yet the EWL did not explicate which forces and member-states presented these challenges. At the global level, the conservative and religious forces from Europe were already well-known from the Beijing Platform negotiations in 1995, where they intervened and made reservations to the Platform. Some of these states (notably Malta and Poland) were now part of the EU and were foreseen to be detrimental to upholding a joint European platform, e.g. in relation to women's sexual and reproductive rights.

Gender Mainstreaming in the EWL Beijing + 10 Review

According to the EWL, the most significant progress in relation to the equality of women and men in the EU during the period had been the integration of the right to equality between women and men into the foundations and objectives of the community legal order, through the Amsterdam Treaty in 1999: *"The Treaty also gives the mandate to the community to "eliminate inequalities and to promote the equality of women and men in all its activities"*.

From the perspective of 2004/05, the dual track principle had been consolidated and was seen as having produced a new approach to policymaking:

*"This has led to a **new approach** to equality between men and women in the EU institutions combining specific mechanisms and policies between women and men in the EU institutions, and combining specific mechanisms and politics for gender equality and the integration of a gender perspective in all areas (**gender mainstreaming**). This dual approach stems from the Beijing Platform for Action and the European Union was also instrumental in encouraging Member States to follow the same policy framework. This positive development was accompanied by the creation of different institutional mechanisms in charge of gender equality and gender mainstreaming."* (EWL Beijing + 10: 7)

Gender mainstreaming now seemed to be an accepted and even positive part of both the Beijing Platform and the European Union interpretations. The former confrontation between positive action and gender mainstreaming was now moderated, and the EWL even argued for the fuller and more systematic application of gender mainstreaming. It stated that too little attention had been paid to the *transformative nature* of gender mainstreaming. Without expanding on this point, the EWL highlighted the missing administrative and bureaucratic tools in the realisation of gender mainstreaming: *"In all gender mainstreaming policies and initiatives, it is important to have less illusive language and more concrete timeframes, budgets, objectives and monitoring tools in place"* (EWL Beijing + 10: 8). In addition, the EWL saw the success of any gender mainstreaming strategy as depending *"very much on political will and on the commitment of individual decision makers officials"*. It is worth noting that the

EWL did not connect gender mainstreaming directly to the mobilisation and multiplication of women's voices or to the application of gender and diversity, as outlined by feminist scholars such as Squires and Hankivsky.

The EWL referred to the Women and Science unit in the European Commission, appreciating its good work, describing it as successful in the field of gender mainstreaming and stating that the activity had spurred a new platform of Women Scientists in 2004.⁷⁰ This contrasted with the very limited progress on integrating gender issues in other policy areas, such as trade policy, the environment and sustainable development for example.

But all in all, the EWL found it difficult to judge the implementation of the new strategy at national levels due to the absence of systematic gender impact assessment. The EWL urged for the application of gender mainstreaming in macroeconomics as a legitimate way of integrating gender equality and economic strategies and plans:

"... the need for coherence between macro-economic and gender mainstreaming policies is not sufficiently acknowledged and therefore the EU fails to recognize the contradictions between promoting gender equality on the one hand and perpetuations or even increasing gender inequalities through macro-economic policies on the other hand" (EWL Beijing + 10: 8).

While gender mainstreaming was urged for by the EWL at the overall level, from the point of the report it does not seem as if the EWL had a fully fledged idea or model of gender mainstreaming as a transformative tool for all of the priority fields of the Beijing Platform. It rather seemed as if gender mainstreaming was applied flexibly and randomly in relation to certain areas. Besides this, in the review there was no real discordance between gender mainstreaming and other kinds of interventions such as specific actions, educational activities, monitoring, statistics etc.; all of which form part of the gender mainstreaming indicators and tools. Also, calls for more participation and space for NGOs were very randomly and unevenly dispersed in the text.

It is hard to judge (and would require further analysis to assess) the uneven application of gender mainstreaming and the lack of a fully fledged idea of gender mainstreaming. Does this reveal internal disparities and compromises within the EWL? Or does this and the other reports in this field present a kind of unfinished brainstorming and open ended framing of ideas? Or does the uneven application of gender mainstreaming relate to the history and path dependency of the EU on the one hand, and the separate histories and developments in each thematic area of the Beijing Platform on the other? It is striking, with respect to the accepted and more central position of gender mainstreaming in the EWL + 10 report, that the new *European Institute for Gender Equality* was seen as a site for "providing

⁷⁰ The Women and Science unit had a budget of 2 million Euro for the first 3 years.

effective tools for gender mainstreaming”, in addition to knowledge sharing, data collection, information on best practices etc. (EWL Beijing + 10: 10).

Recall the working definition of gender mainstreaming referred to earlier as containing both Women’s Participation (WP) and a Gender Dimension (GD). It seems as if the EWL thematic matching of the Beijing Platform (un)intentionally at this point ended up with provisions that will mainly advance the participation of women. This would be more so than elaborating the initial content of the *transformative nature* of gender mainstreaming, which could qualify and substantiate the gender dimension.

The EWL position in the Beijing + 15 report

As already said, the EWL report for the Beijing + 15 *From Beijing to Brussels. An unfinished Journey* consisted in a well laid out booklet with thoroughly researched assessments and recommendations. While this third EWL review of the Beijing process was still focused on the EU developments, it also made openings for a global agenda and to issues beyond the Beijing Platform. In the report, multiple discrimination and intersectional policies were presented as a new area of attention for gender equality, and a whole chapter was aimed at women’s rights and gender equality in EU external politics. Throughout the thematic areas, substantial attention was paid to human rights, gender in development politics, gendered migration, and minority women’s rights in Europe (EWL Beijing + 15: 121-123).

The EWL now proclaimed their full support for the Beijing Platform and stated that: “*The BPfA (Beijing platform) provides a comprehensive and robust framework within which to achieve gender equality and its full and effective implementation must be considered to be a priority*” (EWL Beijing + 15: 125). Yet, in 2010, the clear and optimistic call for a new World Conference and a revision of the Beijing Platform a decade earlier had disappeared from the EWL agenda.

Besides this, the EWL was now more moderate in their political approach, seeing the 2010 Beijing review as part of an incremental process: “*The 2010 review represents an opportunity to build on previous work to allow for real progress in the realisation of women’s rights and de facto equality between women and men in Europe and beyond*” (EWL Beijing + 15: 126). Moreover, the unity of the EWL and the reporting process as a joint project of the EWL members was stressed: “*The gaps highlighted and recommendations made in this report have been shaped by the conjoined voices of women’s representatives from across Europe. The EWL and its members call clearly and firmly for these concerns and recommendations to be heard by political leaders and policy makers*” (EWL Beijing + 15: Foreword).

Yet, in spite of the more moderate tune, the EWL report was presented as the third *alternative* report, which perhaps again indicated a twist in the EWL's position and a commitment of the EWL to consolidate what could be called a critical *outsider within* status towards the EU.

In line with the former reports, the EWL examined the progress made at the EU level across the 12 critical areas of concern in the Beijing Platform, and evaluated and identified gaps, making concrete recommendations. The EWL again contrasted the principal possibilities of the Beijing Platform with the critical and uneven picture of the European situation. The implementation of the commitments made 15 years earlier was mixed and with significant challenges outstanding. All member-states in the Union had taken steps to implement the Platform for Action. But still, considerable differences in the approach and focus of national politics and legislation persisted. Accordingly, the situation of women in the EU was seen as extremely diverse and far from homogeneous in terms of experiences, needs and rights.

Since 2005, progress had taken place in specific core areas, but lack of resources and lack of definite targets had been detrimental for the realisation and follow up, undermining the efficiency of the strategies and programmes. Notably, the *EU Road map for Equality between women and men from 2006 to 2010* and the *EU Gender Pact* adopted by the EU Council in 2006 had been disappointing. Furthermore, poor co-ordination between the national and the European levels persisted in concrete actions.

The EWL list of remaining gaps pointed to both lacks and outright absences of thematic attention and efficient political instruments and tools:

- Inadequate measures to ensure the full participation of women in all areas at all levels in decision making in European institutions.
- Absences of consistent policies to tackle all forms of violence against women.
- Lack of European commitments to address women's sexual and reproductive health and rights.
- Lack of Gender-disaggregated statistics and comparable data.

In the report it is striking (though in line with the dominant logic of late-modern policy creation) that the EWL offered an interpretation of the financial crisis, seeing it now as an opportunity structure rather than in the pessimistic horizon of the earlier report: "*The crisis makes protecting and reinforcing women's rights all the more necessary, while representing a window of opportunity for restructuring institutions, processes and practices, and changing behaviour*" (EWL Beijing + 15: 5). The same twist can be seen in relation to the EWL's notion of gender mainstreaming, which was transformed into the new socio-economic context.

Gender mainstreaming in the Beijing + 15 report

The emerging idea of gender mainstreaming as a positive tool for gender equality in 2005 became quite manifest in the EWL Beijing + 15 review. Here gender mainstreaming was even staged as the *“most important framework tool for the realisation of equality between women and men. Accordingly the full implementation must be prioritized”* (EWL Beijing + 15: 128).

At the same time the EWL, echoing the criticism of several feminist scholars, urged for advancing gender mainstreaming into a truly transformative agenda: *“in the few areas where gender mainstreaming is identifiable, it remains predominantly a practice of integrating women into existing institutions as opposed to challenging and transforming the institutions themselves so that they fully reflect the particular needs and situations of women”*. Yet the EWL was critical towards the narrow approach to gender mainstreaming and the eclipse of the broad goal of securing equality between women and men into an exclusive focus on the tools of mainstreaming. *“This very often results in a technocratic “tick box” approach to pursuing gender equality which excuses inequality between women and men if there is evidence of women mainstreaming tools having been employed”* (EWL Beijing + 15: 127). The EWL further pointed to the fact that gender mainstreaming is often carried out by committed individuals in poorly equipped institutions, institutions which themselves lack commitments and continuities.

Here in 2010, the EWL requested visible and well-resourced bodies *“with sufficient institutional authority to be drivers of an effective and transformative strategy”* (EWL Beijing + 15: 128-129). The EWL now recommended significant financial and human resources to mainstreaming gender as a commitment to equality between women and men. And the EWL assures that: *“this has to take place and remains a focal point for EWL monitoring and activity”*.

At this point, the EWL not only offered blanket support of gender mainstreaming. The lobby also supported the extension of institutional structures and resources, in order to support and advance the goal of gender equality. Hence gender mainstreaming, in the shape of more efficient institutional and strategic measures (in the view of the EWL), could improve the EWL’s work towards gender equality, making it more successful. In that sense, the EWL looked at the institutional structures and tools as complimentary and not as detrimental to its own efforts.

Even if, in the 2010 review, gender mainstreaming is positioned by the EWL as the main and long-term transformative strategy, the EWL maintains the stress on special measures, that are now seen as second to the transformative aspects: *“Gender mainstreaming can be efficient only when combined with specific measures and that gender mainstreaming must not be used as an alibi for dismantling women focused policies, programs or funds”* (EWL Beijing + 15: 128). The EWL, however, still finds it important to upholding the dual strategy laid out earlier: *“it is essential that the goals of equality between women and men are advanced through a dual strategy at all levels in the future”* (EWL Beijing + 15: 128).

In spite of the far more central staging of the gender mainstreaming strategy in the EWL Beijing + 15 report, the concept is still randomly applied throughout both the report and the specific recommendation to the 12 critical areas of the Beijing Platform. Also, the notion of transformation might seem somewhat unclear. It could either be an obstacle to the integration of women, or it could be a chance to address certain structures. However, for the EWL, it seems as if the financial, economic and social crises present possibilities for the progression of gender mainstreaming. That is, the financial crisis can be seen as a potentially transformative moment for shifting mainstream assumptions, as well as an opportunity for introducing a different vision of the world. According to the EWL, the inclusion of women's involvement in financial and economic decision making, and the inclusion of feminist economists in the definition and implementation of recovery policies would be central to the longer term holistic vision of the post crisis world (EWL Beijing + 15: 126).

In the Beijing + 15 report, the EWL pointed to gender mainstreaming as a strategy that is insufficiently understood and implemented. Thematic fields such as *media, education, environment, the girl child and health* make up particular critical areas where new interventions are needed. In that sense, gender mainstreaming can be regarded (in the framework of the EWL Beijing Reports) as a concept on the move, with the different reports seen as feeding into an active process in the production of gender mainstreaming. This would be a process through which gender mainstreaming is moulded and twisted into current and pressing problems of the day, such as the financial crisis, environmental problems etc. All in all, one can talk about a construction process, in which the EWL and the European women's are part and parcel.

Beyond the Beijing + reviews: Multiple Discrimination and Intersectional Politics in the EWL

As said earlier, the EWL Beijing review also goes beyond the Beijing Platform in addressing the broad agenda of multiple discrimination and Equal Opportunities for All, introduced by the European Union over the last decade.⁷¹ The increasing political, social and academic sensitivity to multiple forms of discrimination and inequality also entered the activities of the EWL and is reflected in the review. The EWL took a new and more positive attitude compared with their earlier stance. While multiple-discrimination was dealt with in a critical way in the Beijing + 5 report, in 2010 the EWL took a more nuanced stance towards embracing "equality for all".

⁷¹ The shifting context and strategies were consolidated in the new Lisbon strategy. See the consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union *Official Journal C 83 of 30.3.2010*, notably in article 19 where six dimensions are pointed to.

The EWL described the shift in EU politics as: *“a significant opportunity to advance equality between women and men as it affords a greater appreciation of the differences in the identities, needs and experiences amongst women themselves. For example, it highlights the diverse situations of women in the workplace who are discriminated against not just because they are women, but also because they belong to specific vulnerable groups”* (EWL Beijing + 15).

Also in this context the EWL stressed the transformative dimensions of multiple discrimination, displacing the EU tune of individual discrimination and isolated consciousness-raising into a focus on legal change and the reflection of structural inequalities.

“The pursuit of real change must begin with securing uniform legal protection against discrimination based on all grounds listed in article 19 ... and ensuring that protections against discrimination on multiple grounds can be pursued at both a national and a European level in order to address structural inequalities.” (EWL Beijing + 15)⁷²

In doing so, the EWL left their former position on the multiple discrimination agenda. While they had formerly seen it as opposed to or as undermining gender equality, now they wrote the following:

“Despite the fact that sex-based discrimination is not covered by this Directive, it is an important step towards improving discrimination on a ground other than sex or at the intersection of gender with another ground.” (EWL Beijing + 15: 89)

Accordingly, the EWL now regarded the adoption of a strong new anti-discrimination directive on multiple grounds as a tool for leveling up EU anti-discrimination provision, and more poignantly, as a stepping stone for advancing gender equality (EWL Beijing + 15: 88). Along the same lines, in co-operation with other NGOs, the EWL argued for gender mainstreaming of the directive of fundamental rights. They suggested gender analysis of women’s human rights in the EU and urged for the integration of gender equality into all immigrant, integration and asylum politics as well as in all EU measures to combat racism and discrimination (Beijing + 15 review).⁷³

Furthermore the EWL referred to the new commissioner for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship who took office in 2010. And they expressed their critical confidence in future initiatives

⁷² Meanwhile in 2008 the EWL warned the Commission against the production of *“any hierarchy or rights between the sex-base anti-discrimination legislation and the anti-discrimination legislation on other grounds”* and stressed that gender should be mainstreamed in any new anti-discrimination directive. See EWL statement: EWL calls the European Commission to Ensure a Uniform protection for all grounds of Discrimination: June 2008.

⁷³ One outcome was that gender equality was included in the assignments of the Agency of Fundamental Rights opened in 2007 after pressure from the EWL. And that the EWL and ENAR were now co-working on the integration of gender into immigration provisions (ENAR interview, January 2010).

and the relocation of the issue of gender equality and women's rights into the new EU directorate of Fundamental Rights:⁷⁴

"This will change significantly the perspective of these policies by putting them in a fundamental rights framework. If it is accompanied by strong political will, good co-ordination and sufficient resources, this change could potentially lead to a stronger application of politics for women's rights across all EU activities" (EWL Beijing + 15: 90).

The EWL presented its approach to the issue of multiple discrimination, in the areas of ethnicity and immigration, as a double goal of human rights activities, addressing diversity among women and focusing of EU legislation and provisions.

"The EWL also developed its work in relation to the diversity of women, in particular regarding the need to both give a voice to migrant women's organisations at European level and to integrate a gender perspective into immigration, integration, asylum and antidiscrimination politics as well as the need to tackle multiple discrimination in anti-discrimination legislation." (Beijing + 15. EU - Swedish Presidency 2009: EWL chapter: 27)

From the perspective of 2010, it seems as if the multiple discrimination agenda has spurred a reorientation of the EWL's identity and organisational patterns. Hence the approach taken by the EWL towards the issue of minorities and immigration seems to run along two lines:

- one of integration of minority women into the EWL at organisational levels, and;
- one of transforming the entire EWL agenda to make it more diverse.

In practice, the EWL has made organisational efforts to include minority women and started a self-critical screening process of their own practices and programs towards more inclusive notions of diversity within the predominantly white, middle class ethos of the EWL:

"Well, for us it means also, I think, we've tackled the issue both in a structural manner in terms of looking quite critically on ourselves and trying to enlarge and trying to include new people within our own organisation, and this is why we also have this specific project with migrant women for the last three, five years because we are, we have created a network of migrant women, so the idea for us is to include, physically if you want, the diversity of women within ourselves and also of course with the policies. So this is why we also have some room for other women's organisations, members of the lobby and we try to screen our policy documents with an eye for diversity and representing different groups of women, it's a bit of a challenge because women's organisations are usually more like you and me." (EWL interview, January 2010)

⁷⁴ The new directorate included citizens and minority rights as well as gender equality and anti-discrimination which so far had been placed in the Employment and Social Affairs Directorate.

Overall, in their multiple engagements the EWL substantiate many of the features of Hankivskys notion of “diversity mainstreaming”. This implies a more sophisticated and a more inclusive practice of gender mainstreaming as a move towards a transformative practice of gender mainstreaming. At the same time the EWL exhibits great sensitivity to the very use of the terminology. The EWL officer who we interviewed saw the ideas of diversity and diversity mainstreaming as associated with business strategies and as problematic for the aims of the EWL. Diversity mainstreaming in this shape is regarded as risky and as a tool for making gender invisible in many ways. Even though this is more the personal view of the EWL policy officer, we find the reservations significant for the position of the EWL and women’s organisations more broadly, as we also saw in chapter 3.

“Personally I’m extremely cautious because what I see is that, for me diversity is really something completely different than gender equality. Diversity policies, I know, in the business sector for example includes women, for me, the big risk is that women in fact are very invisible and that’s also the same debates in relation to, you know, having single bodies dealing with gender equalities in the country or having a specific for women’s rights, specific for race or whatever and the risk is that there’s no resources, there’s no visibility, in France for example there’s one body dealing with everything and for example it’s really not obvious from their name, from their visual identity, from general representation that they actually do women and the consequence of this is that they really have, in terms of statistics, very little complaints from women. So me personally, I’m extremely critical of this because the experience really is that when you put everything, everybody in the same box then gender equality becomes invisible.”

Again, overall it seems as if gender mainstreaming has come into the fore and been made a central tool for weaving the broad thematic agenda of the Beijing Platform into the European focus on multiple discrimination and fundamental rights. The EWL can be said to have linked these platforms to create a critical women centred approach. In doing so, they have substantiated gender and other thematic issues of the Beijing Platform and the current EU issues of Fundamental Rights. The EWL has also, in a kind of deliberative move, extended its alliances and co-operations both horizontally in relation to other social NGOs as well as with various EU institutions. These new agendas and alliances, however, are seen as a way of consolidating EWL goals, rather than as something that will change future NGO structures and mobilisations as such:

HRC: *“If you look 10 or 20 years ahead, how does the landscape of NGO’s look like do you think? I mean the diversity agenda, will it change anything, or do you think it will stay the same?”*

CG: *“Well, I hope, I hope that it will help different organisations to, not to stay in their little box, I mean in a way we are lucky as a women’s organisation because we are them all. And because in a way we are*

pioneers in this, in trying to be more inclusive and it might be more difficult for others, even more difficult for others who are even more limited than us.” (EWL interview, January 2010).⁷⁵

The EWL’s manner of dealing with multiple discrimination and diversity can be described as pragmatic. It has been shaped both in relation to bottom-up pressure and claims made by NGOs in the field of minority and immigration and human rights politics, as well as top-down processes where issues and aims have been spurred by the EU and by the global agendas of the UN.

It is interesting that in these matters the EWL take a more moderate position than the EU. In the opinion paper *Opinion on The Future of Gender Equality Policy after 2010 and on the priorities for a possible future framework for Equality between women and men*, issued by the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men, more open opinions are expressed. These are, e.g., related to new gender related claims, which are not proliferated or reflected by the EWL, and legal rights for transgender bi and homosexual individuals and groups.

Here it seems as if the EWL is more in line with the UN and the global agenda. Here it seems as if the UN/ DAW secretary takes a reluctant stance to the new new and broader avenues of European Equality policies and experimenting in new ways of dealing with inequalities.

“Diversity issues are very important, and I wouldn’t negate that at all. But I’m not convinced that the way to make sure there is an inter linkage between gender and other factors of discrimination, is to try notice them in one thing. I really think that you have to take out gender equality because it’s so overarching, so basic. It’s the most basic; it influences you from the day you are born”. (Hannan interview 2009)

All in all, the relations between the EWL and the formal EU bodies of equality have become blurred during recent years. While the EU has proliferated and pushed for the introduction of multiple discrimination, the EWL has maintained a focus on women. At the same time, in the general political landscape of gender quality at the EU level, the EWL has become more proliferated as a feminist and women’s rights organisation, remaining in contrast to conservative mobilisations and representations.⁷⁶

Departing from the Beijing conference and the Beijing + 15 events at the level of the United Nations, we have looked at the strategy and contribution of the European Women’s Lobby towards gender mainstreaming and the Beijing platform. We have shown that the position of the European Women’s Lobby as an outsider within challenges and cross cuts the two models of gender mainstreaming and that new forms of policy making have been produced by gender mainstreaming and the agenda of multiple discrimination.

⁷⁵ These limitations were substantiated by interviews with other NGOs in the area, e.g. ENAR

⁷⁶ E.g. at the EWL general Assembly in 2010 an (Italian) representative was turned down for the first time ever due to her attitudes on abortion and reproductive rights.

Generally speaking, it seems as if gender mainstreaming has come into the fore and been made a central tool for incorporating the broad thematic agenda of the Beijing Platform into the European focus on multiple discrimination and fundamental rights. The EWL can be said to have bridged these platforms to create a critical women-centred approach. The EWL has both entered and challenged the neo-liberal/soft-governance framework of the EU and made pleas for the displacement of the individualised, soft-value agendas into structural measures and macro-economic frameworks at both European and global levels.

Furthermore, in doing so, the EWL has substantiated gender and other thematic issues of the Beijing Platform and the current EU issues of Fundamental Rights. Along with this, the EWL has in a kind of deliberative move, extended its alliances and co-operations both horizontally in relation to other social NGOs as well as with various EU institutions. These new agendas and alliances, however, are seen as a way of consolidating EWL goals, rather than as something that will change future NGO structures and mobilisations as such.

One of the significant outcomes of gender mainstreaming in the political framework of the EU and its member states is the set up and extension of new partnerships between key agents in the making of equality politics in the so-called velvet triangles of networking among agents, activists and experts in movements, institutions and research (Woodward 2003, Schunter- Kleemann 2003). It here seems as if the former division of labour between women's movements, political institutions and knowledge producers has been blurred and relocated along with the implementation of gender mainstreaming.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and Policy Recommendations



The purpose of this report has been to focus on gender mainstreaming as a dimension of gender fair citizenship. Gender mainstreaming emerged as a new global equality strategy in 1995 and was carried at the Fourth UN World Conference in the so called *Beijing Platform for Action*. The notion was endorsed by the EU during the late 1990s, and implemented in the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997. The term “gender mainstreaming” can be seen as an umbrella, covering several concepts that forefront the importance of gender and equality in all policy creation. The aim of gender mainstreaming is gender justice and gender equality, achieved by challenging patriarchal and genderless norms in mainstream policy and thought, and by the mobilisation of various agents in public institutions and civil society. These are features that in some respects converge with the ideal of a gender-fair citizenship for all.

The report has outlined and enhanced existing models and approaches to gender mainstreaming and addressed the upcoming diversity approach, which seeks to integrate multiple discrimination grounds in mainstreaming efforts. The report has dealt with how gender is defined and negotiated in a range of institutions and in relation to political issues, as well as the emergent development of new theoretical and practical tools to enhance the intersection of gender, ethnicity and social class.

The focus of this report has been to settle notions and practices of gender mainstreaming. We have revealed differentiated ideas of institutional practices and linked gender mainstreaming to wider ideas of democracy and mobilisations, by focusing on the following questions:

- How are gender mainstreaming strategies, tools and practices formed, translated and negotiated in current governance processes at EU and at national levels?
- How have institutions and women’s collective agency and mobilisations been staged; and how have they contributed to notions, practice and criticism of gender mainstreaming?
- How can the idea of gender mainstreaming advance ideas and practice of gender-fair citizenship?

The different approaches to gender mainstreaming analysed in the report have been framed by the two models:

1. An expert or bureaucratic model of mainstreaming that refers to the revision of existing policymaking (as outlined above). This refers to the turn of existing policymaking such that equality and non-discrimination perspectives are taken into account in all stages of policymaking, in addition to a long-standing institutionalised commitment to the promotion of equality, implemented by public officials and experts. The focus in this model is on organisational change, on the use of experts and the importance of strategy-building. This implies that gender should be incorporated into all policies at all levels and stages by actors normally involved in policymaking. It also implies that gender equality (and eventually other

transversal dimensions) should be integrated into the routine operations and core functions of any given organisation.

2. A participatory-democratic model of gender mainstreaming that requires equal participation of women's and other groups in society in political and public life. Hence also the promotion of networking, dialogue, social mobilisation and the involvement of NGOs in all stages of policymaking. In the participatory sense, gender mainstreaming can be seen as part of a new governance process, notably in the EU, that has been open for new agendas and areas of policymaking in the field. This model calls for the building of alliances between civil servants, politicians, academics, women's and other social movements, and the media, in order to address new and old areas of discrimination and for the promotion of inclusion and justice. In this model it is crucial to include and empower social movements and civil society into political processes.

The two models also accentuate the tension involved in gender mainstreaming definitions and visions among different agents. Is gender mainstreaming primarily a provision of a comprehensive set of tool kits carried out by normal policy agents and civil servants? Or is gender mainstreaming primarily a political process in which women's participation and gender issues are mobilised and guaranteed a voice in policymaking?

In the report we have demonstrated how existing methodological and theoretical insights can be used, advanced and modified in a range of case studies, to provide new understandings and practices of gender mainstreaming. One of the central insights reached in the report is that both institutional and mobilising strategies need to be applied and advanced in order to realise the potential of the visions introduced in the Beijing Platform for Action.

Moreover, we have critically explored the two-pronged model in relation to institutional and women's movement discourses, discussing how both the EU and the national governments have mainly practiced the strategy of gender mainstreaming as a bureaucratic orientated model. And as a consequence, they have under-prioritised the mobilising and democratic orientated aspects. The focus on gender mainstreaming as a bureaucratic tool might have influenced the adaptation of the strategy by women's movements, or perhaps it has meant that the concept of gender mainstreaming has been regarded as 'foreign'. But we have also showed that the mobilisation impact of the strategy is present, and that gender mainstreaming has been promoted and turned into practice through cooperation between public institutions and women's movements. This was the case, for example, with gender budgeting, which in a large extent has been promoted, developed and implemented by a cooperation between public institutional actions and initiatives from civil society, mainly women's organisations.

The report has questioned a certain critique that claims that the scarce implementation of gender mainstreaming is due to a lack of theory. Instead, the report has emphasised how the strategy, while

worked upon by different agents, has developed in multiple ways that are at least as important as the theoretical framework. Departing from this approach, we have shown how the theoretical basis has been considered to be fairly well developed, while the practical side was described as *still being in a learning process*. Accordingly, we have analysed how gender mainstreaming has been translated in different nation states and in different institutional settings. We have shown how the very term 'gender mainstreaming' was problematised by resistance to the adoption of an English-language concept, but also how the term 'gender' often was conceived as a 'women's thing' and therefore considered to be irrelevant to the mainstream.

The bureaucratic aspect of gender mainstreaming seemed to run into problems due to its central aim of integrating gender perspectives and equality as an extra dimension in the work of agents working with policy-making, i.e. people who were not experts in this field and who normally did not work with gender equality. This task was often met with resistance caused by a confusion of the relevance of gender in their specific area. Moreover, the general and more technical perspectives in the bureaucratic model were in some cases seen as an invitation to focus on small details rather than addressing more important and prominent policies. This, in the case of Germany, led to that the approach to gender mainstreaming was changed into a more narrow focus, where the goals of gender equality were addressed to specific areas and not directed to the mainstream. That is a more fragmented approach which reminds us of earlier gender equality approaches.

Departing from the Beijing conference and the Beijing + 15 events at the level of the United Nations, we have looked at the strategy and contribution of the European Women's Lobby towards gender mainstreaming and the Beijing platform. We have shown that the position of the European Women's Lobby, as an outsider within, challenges and cross cuts the two models of gender mainstreaming. We have also demonstrated that new forms of policy making have been produced by gender mainstreaming and the agenda of multiple discrimination.

One of the significant outcomes of gender mainstreaming in the political framework of the EU and its member states is the establishment and extension of new partnerships between key agents in the creation of equality politics in the so-called velvet triangle of agents in movements, institutions and research. Here it seems as if the former division of labour between women's movements, political institutions and knowledge producers have been blurred and relocated along with the implementation of gender mainstreaming.

1. Gender mainstreaming has reinforced bonds between state/EU machineries and women's movements such as the European Women's Lobby. Simultaneously, it has blurred the boundaries of policymaking, expertise and activism between the EU institutions and women's NGOs. As illustrated in the Beijing review processes, where the EWL acts both as

an insider and expert that delivers the reviews, and as an outsider that makes claims towards the EU.

2. Gender mainstreaming has, at the EU and some national levels, at best become a late-modern and radicalised version of state feminism and a supranational feminism, aiming at equality from above, through the creation of strong public provisions and institutions. As such gender mainstreaming has reinforced the networking female elite of feminists in public administrations, NGOs and experts in universities and consultancies.
3. Gender Mainstreaming has been implemented in new (neo-liberal) compartmentalised policy processes that are fragmented in ongoing, reviews and hearings, which in principle contain new opportunity structures for NGOs. Yet the new governance processes have also produced diffuse and unclear multilevel policy processes and made it difficult for less-resourced NGOs to intervene and to be heard.
4. Gender mainstreaming has, during the Beijing + 15 reviews, been maintained as the most important, overarching long-term equality strategy, at both at the UN, the EU, and many national levels. Yet the lack of progress and resources, which are prerequisites for successful gender mainstreaming, also seem to spur a return to singular issues and less coordinated activities and goals.

There seems to be a general agreement on the need to advance the gender mainstreaming strategy, though opinions differ when it comes to long-term strategies. While the EU policy makers/practitioners have argued for more systematic approaches and efficient tools and indicators, feminist research, not least the FEMCIT project, has revealed the need for a broader and more inclusive approach to both citizenship and gender mainstreaming: one that will clear the way for more inclusive policy processes and intersectional politics.

It seems as if the EU approach to intersectional politics and the policy processes in the field of *Equal Opportunities for All* have stopped half way. Further developments need the provision of well-funded NGO frameworks and coalitionbuilding, as well as new and crosscutting institutional tools and models of representation.

Policy Recommendations

The FEMCIT gender mainstreaming report has focused on gender mainstreaming as a dimension of gender fair citizenship. It has focused on how gender mainstreaming has been brought into the agenda, politically, discursively and empirically. Moreover, the focus has been on gender

mainstreaming as a network of communicative events, including tensions and visions among different institutions and actors. Should gender mainstreaming primarily consist in the provision of a comprehensive set of tool kits carried out by normal policy actors and civil servants? Or should gender mainstreaming be primarily a political process in which women's participation and gender issues are mobilised and guaranteed a voice in policymaking? How has gender mainstreaming been perceived and produced in the Beijing Processes, by Governmental units and gender related NGOs at the European levels.

One of the points underlined throughout the report is that both institutional and mobilising strategies need to be advanced in order to realise the potential of the visions introduced in the Beijing Platform for Action and the "holistic" notion of gender mainstreaming. Along with the FEMCIT call for gender fair citizenship in multicultural Europe, it seems as if the EU processes in the field of *Equal Opportunities for All* have stopped half way, and that further developments need the provision of well-funded NGO frameworks and coalitions, as well as new and crosscutting institutional tools.

Accordingly we suggest the following policy recommendations:

1. There is a need for critical and diverse voices in Gender Mainstreaming reporting systems. Governmental units have expanded and been consolidated over the last two decades due to, for instance, the requirements of gender mainstreaming. In particular, this means that women's NGOs have a relatively weak representation in decision making and reporting systems at national levels. It is vital to secure the critical and diverse voices of women's movements and civil society in future reporting mechanisms. This requires both mandates, knowledge and resources.
2. There is a need for new and more diverse gender mainstreaming indicators to measure progress in the Beijing Processes at European levels. New initiatives need to be supplemented with the provision and integrated analysis of other sets of data and expertise where gender is related to ethnicity, age, sexuality etc. There is a need for methodological changes and improvements of the gender mainstreaming strategy, changes that will guarantee the provision of diverse data which can be combined in new ways.
3. There is a need for a new architecture of gender representation in Europe and elsewhere. The FEMCIT project as a whole provides a new mapping of European women's movements, which also specifies hierarchies/ and representational structures in relation to majority/minority cultures in a wide field. This invites a revision of representational traditions and structures at national, European and global levels; it raises vital questions such as: Who is entitled to attend and have a voice at major conferences? Who has the right to be accredited and to participate in hearings and consultations at national, EU and UN levels?

4. There is a need to extend the representation of gender expertise and NGOs into all policy bodies and committees related to the 12 critical areas of the Beijing Platform in order to advance the implementation of gender mainstreaming.

REFERENCES

Alaimo, Stacy (2010): The naked word: The trans-corporeal ethics of the protesting body, pp. 15–36 in *Women & Performance: a journal of feminist theory* Vol. 20, No. 1, March 2010.

Andersen, Gøsta Esping (1990): *The Three World's of Welfare Capitalism*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Andersen, Niels Åkerstrøm (1999): *Diskursive analysestrategier*. Nyt fra Samfundsvidenskaberne, København.

Artemjeff, Panu & Kirsti Henriksson (2006): *Mainstreaming Equality. Conceptual Development and Mainstreaming Model of the JOIN in Project*. Mainstreaming Equality and Non-discrimination in Theory and Practice. Experiences from the Join in Project. Helsinki.

Beveridge, Fiona & Nott, Sue (2002): Mainstreaming: A Case for Optimism and Cynicism, pp. 299-311. in *Feminist Legal Studies*, vol. 10.

Beveridge, Fiona & Velluti, Samantha (eds.) (2008): *Gender and the Open Method of Coordination: Perspectives on Law, Governance and Equality in the EU*. Ashgate, Surrey.

Booth, Christine & Bennett, C. (2002): Gender Mainstreaming in the European Union. Towards a New Conception and Practice of Equal Opportunities?, in *The European Journal of Women's Studies*. vol. 9, no 4.

Brade, Louise; Hansen, Vibeke Holm & Lyshøj, Mette (2004): *Mange bække små... Mainstreaming i teori og praksis*. Hovedopgave. Sociologisk Institut, Copenhagen

Butler, Judith (1990): *Gender Trouble*. Routledge, London and New York.

Bygnes, Susanne (2010): Making Equality Diverse? Merged Gender Equality and Anti-Discrimination Measures in Norway, in *Nora. Nordic journal of Feminist and Gender Research* vol. 18, no. 2

Carsten Nielsen, Sofie (2002): Fru Danmark og Hr. EU. Kønskonstruktioner i den danske debat om EU, in Leonora Christina Skov (red.): *De røde sko. Feminisme nu*. Tiderne Skifter, København.

Charlesworth, Hilary (2006): Not Waving, but Drowning: Gender Mainstreaming and Human Rights in the United Nations, in *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, vol. 18: 1-17.

Chow, Esther Ngan-lin (1996): Making Waves, Moving Mountains: Reflections on Beijing '95 and beyond, pp.185-192 in *Signs* vol. 22, no. 1.

Connell, R.W (1995): *Masculinities*. University of California Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams (1994): Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color, in: Martha Fineman & Rixanne Mykitiuk (eds.): *The Public Nature of Private Violence*. Taylor & Francis/Routledge, New York.

Crenshaw, Kimberle Williams (2006): Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence against Women of Color, pp. 7-20 in *Kvinder, Køn og Forskning*, vol. 14, no 2-3.

Davis, Kathy (2008): Intersectionality as Buzz Word: A Sociology of Science Perspective on What Makes a Feminist Theory Successful, p. 67 in *Feminist Theory*, no. 9.

Desai, Manisha (2006): From Autonomy to Solidarities: Transnational Feminist Political Strategies" p. 457-468, in Kathy Davis, Mary Evans & Judith Lorber: *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*. Sage Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

Dijk, Teun van (2001/2004): *Critical discourse analysis*. Second draft 1998, <http://web4.uwindsor.ca/users/w/winter/40-328.nsf/> printed in Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen & Heidi Hamilton (eds.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* Blackwell Publishing 2001/2004.

Eveline, Joan & Bacchi, Carol (2005): What are we mainstreaming when we mainstream gender?, pp. 496-512 in *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, vol. 7, no. 4.

Fairclough, Norman, Pardo, Simon & Szerszynski, Bronislaw (2006): Critical Discourse Analysis and Citizenship, p. 98-123 in Hausendorf, H. & A. Bora (eds.): *Analyzing Citizenship Talk*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Ferree, Myra Marx (2006): Framing Equality: The Politics of Race, Class and Gender in the US, Germany and the Expanding European Union, in: Silke Roth(eds): *Gender Issues and Women's Movements in the Enlarged European Union*. Berghan Books, London, New York.

Fraser, Nancy (1997): *Justice Interruptus. Critical Reflections on the 'Postsocialist' Condition*. Routledge, London.

Gatens, M. (1996): Through a Spinozist Lens: Ethnology, Difference, Power, in Patton, P. (ed.): *Deleuze: A Critical Reader*, Oxford/Blackwell, pp. 162-187. Colebrook, C. (2001): From Radical Representations to Corporeal Becomings: The Feminist Philosophy of Lloyd, Grosz and Gatens. In *Hypatia* 15, 2, pp. 76-93.

Habermas, Jürgen (1976): *Bogerlig offentlighet – dets fremvekst og forfal*. Oslo 1976/ translated from German: *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*. 3 aufl. 1968.

Halsaa, Beatrice & Cecilie Thun (2010): *Partnering with the State? The role of women's organisations in governmental, CEDAW and CERD consultation processes*. [Oslo]: Centre for Gender Research, University of Oslo. Workingpaper No. 4, Stra d 1, PLUREQ.

Halsaa, Beatrice & Sümer, Sevil (2010): D.7.7. Paper on the contributions of WP 1-6 to the overall FEMCIT aims regarding architecture for gender-fair citizenship and integrating the citizenship dimensions. FEMCIT.

Hankivsky, Olena (2005): Gender vs. Diversity Mainstreaming: a Preliminary Examination of the Role and Transformative Potential of Feminist Theory, in *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 38, no. 4: 977-1001.

Hansen, Lene (2000): The Ambiguous Attraction of Europe, in Morten Kelstrup & Michael C. Williams (eds.): *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration. Power, Security and Community*. Routledge: London and New York

Hegnhøj, Rikke(2008): *Multidimensional Discrimination Policies in the Nordic Countries -an overview*, NIKK, Oslo.

Hobson, Barbara & Morgan, David(2002): Introduction in Barbara Hobson (eds.) *Making Men into Fathers: Men, Masculinities, and the Social Politics of fatherhood*. Cambridge University Press, NY, pp. 1-21.

Jenson, Jane (2009): Lost in Translation: The Social Investment Perspective and Gender Equality, pp 446-483, in *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*. Volume 16, number 4, winter 2009:.

Johnson, Carol (2010): The Politics of Affective citizenship: From Blair to Obama, in *Citizenship Studies* 14: 5. 495-509. 2010

Jordana, Jacint & Levi-Faur, David (2004): The Politics of Regulation in the Age of Governance, in Jacint Jordana. & David Levi-Faur (eds): *The Politics of Regulation, Institutions and Regulatory Reforms for the Age of Governance*. Edgar Elgar, Sheltenham.

Jørgensen, Marianne et al (1999): *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode*. Samfundslitteratur, Roskilde.

Kezar, Adrianna (2003): Transformational Elite Interviews: Principles and Problems, in: *Qualitative Inquiry* 9, 2003.

Kimmel, Michael S., Hearn, Jeff & Connell, R.W. (2005): *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Kvinder, Køn og Forskning: Interseksjonalitet, 2-3, 2006

Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidsskrift, 2003,1

Laclau, Ernesto and Mouffe, Chantal (1985): *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso, London & New York.

Lazar, Michelle M. (2007): Methodology of feminist discourse analysis: Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a Feminist Discourse Praxis, in *Critical Discourse Studies*, Volume 4, Issue 2 August 2007, pp. 141 – 164.

Lombardo, Emanuela (2005): Integrating or Setting the Agenda? Gender Mainstreaming in the European Constitution-Making Process, in *Social Politics* 12(3): 412-432.

Lombardo, Emanuela & Meier, Petra (2006): Gender Mainstreaming in the EU. Incorporating a Feminist Reading. In *European Journal of Women's Studies*, May 2006 vol. 13 no. 2.

Madsen, Diana Højlund (2010): *Getting the Institutions Right for Gender Mainstreaming – the Strategy of Gender Mainstreaming Revisited in a Ghanaian Context*. Roskilde Universitet.

Majone, G. (1994): The Rise of the Regulatory State in Europe, in *West European Politics* no. 17: 77-101

Marling, Raili (2010): The Intimidating Other: Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis of the Representation of Feminism in Estonian Print Media, in *Nora. Nordic journal of Feminist and Gender Research*. Vol 18, no. 1, 7-19. March, 2010.

McCall, Leslie (2005): The Complexity of Intersectionality, in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 30, no. 3: 1771-1800.

Michalski, Anna (2005): The EU as a Soft Power: The force of persuasion, pp 124-144 in J. Melssen (eds.): *The New Public diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations*. Basingstoke-Macmillan

Mohanty, Chandra. T. (2003): Under Western Eyes, in: *Feminism without Borders. Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, pp. 221-251, Duke University Press.

Mouffe, Chantalle (1992): Feminism, Citizenship and Radical Democratic Politics, in Judith Butler & Joan W. Scott (eds.): *Feminists Theorize the Political*. Routledge London and New York.

Okin, Susan Moller (1999): Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?, in Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard & Martha C. Nussbaum (eds.): *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Phoenix, Ann (2006): Interrogating Intersectionality: Productive ways of theorising multiple positioning, in *Kvinder, Køn og Forskning*, vol. 14, no. 2-3, 2006: 21-31.

Pollack, Mark A. & Hafner-Burton, E. (2000): Mainstreaming in the European Union, in *Journal of European Public Policy* vol. 7, no. 3.

Pollack Mark A. & Emilie Hafner-Burton (2004): Mainstreaming Gender in the European Union, in *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 73, special issue: 432-56.

Prins, Baujke (2006): Mothers and Muslims. Sisters and Sojourners, pp 234-249 in Kathy Davis, Mary Evans & Judith Lorber: *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*. Sage Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

Rees, Teresa (1998): *Mainstreaming Equality in the European Union*. Routledge, London.

Rees, Teresa (2002): Gender Mainstreaming: Misappropriated and Misunderstood? Paper presented to the Department of Sociology, University of Sweden, February 2002.

Rees, Teresa (2005): Reflections on the uneven development of gender mainstreaming in Europe, in *International Journal of Feminist Politics*, vol. 7, no. 4: 555-574.

Sainsbury, Diana (1999): Gender, Policy Regimes and Politics, pp 245-275 in Diana Sainsbury(eds.): *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*. Oxford University Press.

Scott, Joan (1986): Gender – A Useful Category of Historical Analysis, pp. 1053-1075 in *American Historical Review* 91. no. 5. 1986.

Shaw, Jo (2002): The European Union and gender mainstreaming. Constitutionally embedded or comprehensively marginalized?, in *Feminist Legal Studies*, vol. 10, number 3-4, 2002.

Schunter-Kleemann (2003): Was ist neoliberal am Gender-Mainstreaming in Widerspruch 44: Feminismus, Gender, geschlecht. 23.jg.

Squires, Judith (1999): *Gender in Political Theory*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Squires, Judith (2005): Is Mainstreaming Transformative? Theorizing Mainstreaming in the Context of Diversity and Deliberation, pp. 366-388 in *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, vol. 12, no. 3.

Staunæs, Dorte & Søndergaard, Dorte Marie (2006): Intersektionalitet – udsat for teoretisk justering, pp. 43-56 in *Kvinder, Køn og Forskning*, vol. 14, no. 2-3.

Stratigaki, Maria (2005): Gender Mainstreaming vs. positive Action: An ongoing Conflict in EU Gender Equality Policy, pp. 165-186 in *European Journal of Women's Studies*, no. 12.

Strasser, Sabine (2010): D 7.8. Paper on Citizenship and Intersectionality. FEMCIT.

Sümer, Sevil (2009): *European Gender Regimes and Policies. Comparative Perspectives*. Ashgate, London

Trentman, Frank (2007): *Citizenship and Consumption in Journal of Consumer Culture*. Sage Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

True, Jacqui & Michael Mintrom (2001): Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming, pp. 27-57 in *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 45, no.1.

Valiulis, Maryann & Redmond, Jennifer (2007): Report issued in relation to the 2007 European year of Equal Opportunities for All. The Center for Gender and Women's Studies, Schools of History and Humanities. Trinity College Dublin.

Verloo, Mieke (2005): Displacement and Empowerment: Reflections on the Concept and Practice of the Council of Europe Approach to Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Equality, pp. 344-365 in *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*. Volume 12, number 3, fall 2005.

Verloo, Mieke (2006): Multiple Inequalities. Intersectionality and the European Union, pp. 211-228 in *European Journal of Women's Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3.

Verloo, Mieke & Lombardo, Emanuela (2007): Contested Gender Equality and Policy Variety in Europe. Introducing a Critical Frame Analysis Approach, in Mieke Verloo (eds.): *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality A critical frame analysis of gender policies in Europe*. CPS Books, Budapest.

Walby, Sylvia (2004): The European Union and Gender Equality: Emergent Varieties of Gender Regime, pp. 4-29 in *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, no. 1.

Walby, Sylvia (2005): Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in Theory and Practice, pp. 321-341 in *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, vol. 12, no. 3.

Winther Jørgensen, Marianne, Phillips, Louise (1999): *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode*. Samfundslitteratur, København.

Woodward, Alison: (2003): Building Velvet Triangles: gender and informal governance, in Thomas Christiansen & Simona Piattoni: *Informal Governance in the European Union*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Woodward, Alison (2001/2008): Too late for Gender mainstreaming? Taking Stock in Brussels, p. 289 in *Journal of European Social Policy* 2008, 18.

Yuval-Davis, Nira (1997): Women, Citizenship and Difference, pp. 4-27 in *Feminist Review*, no. 57.

Yuval-Davies, Nira (2006): Intersectionality and Feminist Politics, pp. 193-209 in *European Journal of Women's Studies*, vol 13, no. 3.

Reports

Alliance of German Women's Organizations (2008): Alternative Report submitted by the Alliance of German Women's Organizations in response to the 6th Periodic Report of the Federal German Government on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). Berlin, November 2008.

<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/ngos/AGWOGermany43.pdf>

Association for Women's Rights in Development (2010): FINAL STATEMENT CONCERNING BEIJING +15 PROCESS REVIEW AT COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN:

<HTTP://WWW.AWID.ORG/ISSUES-AND-ANALYSIS/LIBRARY/FINAL-STATEMENT-CONCERNING-BEIJING-15-PROCESS-REVIEW-AT-COMMISSION-ON-THE-STATUS-OF-WOMEN>

Austria: Response to the questionnaire on Implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action: <http://www.unece.org/gender/documents/Beijing+15/Austria.pdf>

Baładynowicz-Panfil, Katarzyna & Urszula Opacka (2005): Gdańsk Gender Budget Initiative

Beijing + 5. Regional alternative report for the European Union. Presented by the Europeans Women's Lobby. May 2000, pp 1-78

Beijing + 10: 1995-2005: Review of the Implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action by the European Union. Report by the European Women's Lobby. November 2004. pp 1-97

Beijing + 15: From Beijing to Brussels. An Unfinished Journey. The European Women's Lobby. Beijing + 15 Report on the Activities of the European Union. Brussels, February 2010. pp 1-132

Beijing + 15. The Platform for Action and the European Union. Report from the Swedish Presidency of the Council of the European Union. Se 2009.eu.

Beijing + 15 2009 + statements from: Beijing + 15, Regional Review Meeting, Geneva 2-3, 2009, Economic Commission for Europe (ECE).

Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (1995).The Fourth World Conference on Women, <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/pdf/BDPfA%20E.pdf>

Beijing Platform for Action. *Chapter VI: Financial Arrangements* <http://www.un-documents.net/bpa-6.htm>

BEIGEWUM (2002): *Frauen macht Budgets. Staatsfinanzen aus Geschlechterperspektive*, Wien.

BMF (2002): *Is the Austrian tax system really "gender-neutral"? Results of a wage and income tax comparison between men and women*. Wien. <http://www.bmf.gv.at/>

Bundeskanzleramt Frauen, Federal Chancellery, Department II/1: Gender Budgeting Examples on National-, Provincial- and Local Community Level. Austria.

Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, 2000. Article 21.

Commission Communication of the 21st of February 1996 *Incorporating equal opportunities for women and men into all Community policies and activities*, COM (96) 67 final)

Commission of the European Communities and Donnelly 2003

Community framework strategy on gender equality (2001-2005)

Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union/The Lisbon Treaty, 2008.

Contact Group on Gender, Note and Annex A/Conf.177/L2. July 7, 1995

Council Conclusions on the review of the implementation by the Member States and the EU institutions of the Beijing Platform for Action. Beijing + 15 Review Progress. Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council Meeting Brussels 30 November 2009.

Council of Europe: Gender Mainstreaming: Conceptual Framework, Methodology and Presentation of Good Practices. Final Report of the Activities of the Group of Specialists on Mainstreaming, EG-S-MS (98)2, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1998: 12-13.

Council of Europe 2005: Gender budgeting. Final report of the Group of Specialists on gender budgeting (EG-S-BG). Directorate General of Human Rights. Strasbourg, 2005.

ECE/AC.28/2009/3 Regional review of progress: Regional synthesis.
[http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing15/docs/ECE AC.28 2009 2 ENG.pdf](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing15/docs/ECE_AC.28_2009_2_ENG.pdf)

Equality and non discrimination in an enlarged European Union. Green paper. May 2004.

Equality and non-discrimination — Annual report 2006
http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/eyeq/uploaded_files/documents/spidla_en.pdf

European Commission. Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities Unit G2: *EU rules on Gender Equality. How are they transposed into National Law?* 2009.

European Journal of Women's Studies, 2005.

European Gender Budgeting Network (2006): *Description of gender budgeting initiatives*.

European Women's Lobby (EWL) (2004): *Gender Budgeting – An overview by the European Women's Lobby*

EWL calls the European Commission to ensure a uniform protection for all grounds of discrimination June 2008.

[HTTP://WWW.WOMENLOBBY.ORG/IMG/PDF/EWL_STATEMENT_ANTI_DISCRIMINATION_EN.PDF](http://www.womenlobby.org/img/pdf/EWL_STATEMENT_ANTI_DISCRIMINATION_EN.PDF)

Executive Summary and Questions for the Pre-Session Working Group (2008): Shadow Report by the "Alliance of German Women's Organizations" on the Sixth Periodic Report by the German Government on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).

FEMCIT (2010): Work Package Presentations for the FEMCIT Research Dissemination Seminar: Gendered Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Issues, Challenges, Visions. Brussels 23 September 2010.

FEMCIT policy Document based on Brussels presentations. D.7.11. 2010

FEMCIT (2010) report of WP 4, Halsaa, Beatrice et al.

Framework Strategy on Gender Equality – Work Programme for 2005 SEC, 2005

Halsaa, Beatrice (2009): *The "impact" of women's movements and the "architecture" of gender-fair citizenship – conceptual discussions within FEMCIT*. Working Paper No. 3.

Jämi Report 2009: *Jämställdhetsintegrering*. <http://www.jamiprogram.se/publikationer/>

Ministerio de Trabajo y Assuntos Sociales (2006): *National Plan to Heighten Awareness and Prevent Gender-based Violence*

Ministry of Children and Equality (2007): *Guide to gender equality assessments and discussion in ministry budget propositions*. Ministry of Children and Equality, Norway

Nairobi Forward Looking Strategy for the Advancement of Women and Charlesworth (2006).

Norway: Response to the questionnaire on Implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action: <http://www.unecce.org/gender/documents/Beijing+15/Norway.pdf>

Norwegian Ministry of Children and Equality (2008): *Gender Equality 2009? Objectives, strategy and measures for ensuring gender equality.*

http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/BLD/Rapporter/2008/BLD_likestillingsrapport_eng_.pdf

Österreichischer Frauenring: Response to the Austrian answers to the questionnaire on Implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action

<http://www.unece.org/gender/documents/Beijing+15/Austrian%20Frauenring.pdf>

Poland: Response to the questionnaire on Implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action: <http://www.unece.org/gender/documents/Beijing+15/Poland.pdf>

Proposals for Consideration in the Preparation of a Draft Declaration. Draft Platform for Actions. 24. May 1995 Note by the Secretary General.

<http://www.un.org/esa/gopher-data/conf/fwcw/off/al--1.en>

Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women. Beijing 4-15 September 1995. United Nations. New York 1996. <http://www.scribd.com/doc/23761212/Beijing-Full-Report-E-www-Un-org-7des09>

SaLDO (2007): *Et samfunnsregnskap for likestilling og diskriminering.* Oslo: Likestillings- og diskrimineringsombudet.

The Commission on the Status of Women. Report on the Fifty Fourth session 1-12 March 2010. Economic and Social Council, official Records 2010. Supplement no. 7 .

The European Commission (2008). *External evaluation of the 2007 European Year of Equal Opportunities for All (EYEO)*, The 2007 European Year of Equal Opportunities for All

European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities.

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=423&newsId=483&furtherNews=yes>

The 2007 European Year of Equal Opportunities for All. European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Final Report, December 2008.

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=423&newsId=483&furtherNews=yes>

The 2007 European Year of Equal Opportunities for All. European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Thematic Report on Gender Mainstreaming. December 2008

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=423&newsId=483&furtherNews=yes>

The Swedish Presidency of the Council of the European Union (2009). Beijing + 15. The Platform for Action and the European Union. Report from the Swedish Presidency of the Council of the European Union.

Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union *Official Journal C 83 of 30.3.2010*

UN 2009: REGIONAL REVIEW OF PROGRESS – Achievements and challenges in promoting gender equality in the ECE region by country. <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G09/237/22/PDF/G0923722.pdf?OpenElement>

United nation's publication Sales no 96.IV 13.

Women's Council in Denmark. Comment to Danish Beijing +15 report (2009)
http://www.unece.org/gender/National_Reports.html

Web pages

Celebrating 2007: Best of 2007. European Year of Equal Opportunities for All. National Campaign Highlights: www.equality2007.europa.eu

European Women's Lobby, Reports and Websites: [www. http://www.womenlobby.org](http://www.womenlobby.org)

UN (2009): REGIONAL REVIEW OF PROGRESS – Achievements and challenges in promoting gender equality in the ECE region by country: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G09/237/22/PDF/G0923722.pdf?OpenElement>

Videos

Audio visuals available at www.equality2007.europa.eu.

Are We so different indeed? TV spot. 78 secs. Lithuania.

Elise. Short Film. 1. min. Norway.

Playground. TV spot. 30 sec. Poland.

Annex 1: Mapping Gender Mainstreaming Initiatives in the EU countries

Overview on institutional mechanisms in the countries

	Gender Equality Ministry	Equality bodies	Equality complaints bodies	Gender Equality Legislation	Gender budgeting	Action Plan on Gender Equality
Austria	No	The Equal Treatment Board The Minister for Women and Public Service attached to the Federal Chancellery (2008)	Ombud for Equal Treatment	The Federal Equal Treatment Act The Equal Treatment Act	Yes.	No.
Belgium	No.	Institute for the Equality between Women and Men (2004) Council for Equal Opportunities between Men and Women Commission on Women and Development	Institute for the Equality between Women and Men (2004)		No.	Yes.
Bulgaria	No (The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy)	Consultative Commission on Equal Opportunities	Commissioner for Protection Against Discrimination	The Gender Equality Policy	No	Yes.
Cyprus	No.	No.	The Office of the Commissioner for Administration (Ombudsman)	No.	No.	Yes.
Czech Republic	No (The Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs)	The Government Council for Equal Opportunities for Women and Men	No gender specific (Office of Public Defender of Human Rights)	No.	No.	Yes.
Denmark	The Minister for Gender Equality	The Department of Gender	Board of Equal Treatment (replaced the	The Act on Gender Equality	Nordic Gender budgeting	Yes.

	(1999)	Equality	Gender Equality Board in 2009)		project 2004-2006	
Estonia	No.	The Gender Equality Department (2004)	Gender Equality Commissioner (2005)	The Gender Equality Act (GEA) (2004)	No.	No.
Finland	No (The Ministry of Social Affairs and Health)	The Gender Equality Unit (2001) The Council of Equality (2001)	Ombudsman for Equality (2001)	The Act on Equality between Women and Men	Yes.	Yes.
France			High Commission against Discrimination and for Equality - Halde		Yes.	Yes.
Germany	No (Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth)	Bundestag Committee on Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth Bundesrat Committee on Women and Youth	Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency	The General Equal Treatment Act (2006) The Federal Equality Act (2006)		Yes.
Greece	No (Ministry of the Interior)	The General Secretariat for Gender Equality Special Parliamentary Committee on Human Rights and Gender Equality	The Greek Ombudsman	No.	No.	Yes.
Hungary	No (The Ministry of Youth, Family, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities)	The Council for Gender Equality The Governmental Office of Equal Opportunities The Council for the Social Equality of Women and Men	Equal Treatment Authority (2004)	Act on the promotion of equal treatment and equal opportunities (2003)	No.	No.
Ireland	No. (The Minister for	The Equality Authority and	Equality	The Equal Status	No.	Yes.

	Justice, Equality and Law Reform)	the Equality Tribunal (1999) The National Women's Council of Ireland	authority	Act (2000) The Equality Act (2004)		
Italy	The Minister of Equal Opportunities	National Commission for equal opportunities between women and men National Equality Advisory National Council of Economics and Labour – working group on gender equality	Not gender specific	The National Code of Equal Opportunities between women and men (2006)	No.	No.
Latvia	No. (Ministry of Welfare)	The Department of European and Legal Affairs, with the Gender Equality Unit	Office of the Ombudsman	No specific gender legislation.	No.	Yes.
Lithuania	No (Ministry of Social Security and Labour)	Inter-Ministerial Commission on Equal Opportunities of Women and Men The European Institute for Gender Equality	Office of the Equal Opportunities Ombudsman	Law on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (2004)	No.	Yes.
Luxembourg			Centre pour l'égalité de traitement			Yes.
Malta	No.	The National Body for Equality The Department for Women in Society The Commission for	National Commission for the Promotion of Equality – NCPE	The Equality for Men and Women Act (2004)	No.	No.

		the Advancement of Women				
Netherlands	No. (The Minister for Emancipation)	The Equal Treatment Commission Emancipation Review Commission (VCE) (2004)	Equal Treatment Commission - CGB	Article 1 of the Constitution and the Equal Treatment Act (2005)	No.	Yes.
Poland	No (The Ministry of Labour and Social Policy)	The Department for Women, Family and Counteracting Discrimination (2006) The Council of Ministers for Equal Treatment (2009)	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy - Department of Women, Family and Counteracting Discrimination (Observer)	No specific equality legislation act.	No.	No.
Portugal	No.	The Commission for Citizenship and Gender Equality (CIG) The Commission for Equality in Work and Employment (CITE) (1979)	Commission for Citizenship and Gender Equality - CIG	The Law on Equal Opportunities and Equal Treatment for Men and Women in Work, Employment and Vocational Training (1979)	No.	Yes.
Romania	No. (The Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Protection)	The National Agency for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men (ANES) The National Commission in the field of Equal Opportunities between Women and Men – CONES (2000)	National Council for Combating Discrimination - CNCD	Law on equal opportunities between women and men (2002 + 2007)	No.	Yes.
Slovakia	No. (The Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family with the	The Council for Gender Equality The Committee on the	National Centre for Human Rights	The Antidiscrimination Act (2004)	No.	Yes.

	division of Family and Gender Policy)	Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination of Women The Coordination Committee for Women's Issues (1996)				
Slovenia	No.	The Government Office for Equal Opportunities The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against women	Gender equality Ombudsman office	The Act on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (2002)	No.	Yes.
Spain	The Ministry of Equality (2008)	The Secretariat-General for Equality Policies (2004) The Government's Delegate Committee for Equality Policy (2008) The Interministerial Committee of Equality between Men and Women	Defensoria - Gender Equality Ombud	Organic Act 1 (2004) on Comprehensive Measures against Gender Violence Organic Act 3 (2007) on Effective Equality between Men and Women (LOIE).	Yes.	Yes.
Sweden	The Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality (2006)	Minister for Gender Equality	The Equality Ombudsman	The new Discrimination Act (2009)	Yes.	Yes.
United Kingdom	Minister for Women and Equality		Equality and Human Rights Commission – EHRC	The Equality Act (2006) The Equality Bill (2009)	No.	Yes.
Iceland	No. (The Minister of Social Affairs and Social Security)	The Centre for Gender Equality The Gender Equality Watch The Gender Equality Council	The Gender Equality Complaints Committee	The Act on Equal Status and Equal Rights of Women and Men (2008)	No.	Yes.

Norway	No. (The Ministry of Children and Equality by the Department of Family and Equality)	The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Tribunal	The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud – LDO	The Gender Equality Act	Yes.	Yes.
---------------	--	---	--	-------------------------	------	------

NGO: Cooperation with NGOs

Practices: Gender mainstreaming: good practices?

Gender or equality mainstreaming?

Annex 2: Interview guide – public institutions

Theme	Question
A. Position and ministry B. Focus areas	a. What ministry do you work in? a. What is your position within the department? b. Within which area does the department work, i.e. gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race etc?
C. Cooperation	c. Do you cooperate with NGO's/movements? Which and how? c. Do you cooperate with EU or other international organisations/units? Which and how?
D. Equality Strategies – Gender Mainstreaming	d. Has gender mainstreaming been a strategy in programmes within the ministry? Which programmes? d. Which recent initiatives of gender equality did the department have, fx action plans, single issues etc? d. Has gender quotas been applied as a demand or tool for gender equality? Why/why not? When and within which areas?
E. The European Year of Equality for All	e. Did you have any activities in 2007 which concerned matters of the year of Equality for All? Which? e. Which central areas did you focus on?
F. Gender Mainstreaming – Equality Mainstreaming	f. How do you relate to the issue of equality mainstreaming, fx as an impediment or supplement to gender mainstreaming? How and why?
G. Other comments etc. Documents!?	Remarkable initiatives/programmes right now/last years? Future scenarios – The big challenges in the future? Resources – Which resources do you have (fx budget)?

Annex 3: Interview guide – NGOs

Theme	Question
A. Type of organisation	a. Which type of movement/NGO is your organisation? a. When was your organisation/network started/founded?
B. Focus areas	b. Within which area does your organisation work, i.e. gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race etc? b. What are the key issues and goals of your organisation?
C. Cooperation	c. Do you cooperate with other NGO's/movements? Which and how? c. Do you cooperate with any governmental units? Which and how? c. Do you cooperate with EU or other international organisations/units? Which and how?
D. Equality Strategies – Gender Mainstreaming	d. Do you mention mainstreaming in the regulations/basis for your NGO/movement? d. Has gender mainstreaming been a strategy in initiatives within your organisation? d. Which recent initiatives of gender equality did your organisation have, e.g. action plans, single issues etc? d. Has gender quotas been applied as a demand or tool for gender equality by your organisation? When and within which areas?
E. The European Year of Equality for All	e. Did you have any activities in 2007 which concerned matters of the year of Equality for All? Which? e. Which central areas did you focus on?
F. Gender Mainstreaming – Equality Mainstreaming	f. How do you relate to the issue of equality mainstreaming, e.g. as an impediment or supplement to gender mainstreaming? How and why?
G. Other comments etc. Documents?!	Remarkable initiatives/programmes right now/last years? Future scenarios – The big challenges in the future? Resources – Which resources do you have (e.g. budget)?

Annex 4: Questionnaire – Public institutions

QUESTIONNAIRE

National institutions/governmental levels

Contact information: Name of your institution, your country and e-mail address

Gender Equality Institutions

1. Do you have a minister for gender equality?

Please **highlight** or make a cross **X** at the right answer.

Yes

No

2. If yes, since when?

Year: _____

3. Do you have special governmental units or departments for gender equality?

Please **highlight** or make a cross **X** at the right answer.

Yes

No

4. If yes, since when?

Year: _____

5. Names and governmental affiliation?

6. When was the latest reform or changes of the gender equality institutions, i.e. departments/units?

Year: _____

7. Does the minister or departments focus on other discrimination variables than gender?

Please **highlight** or make a cross **X** at the right answer.

Yes

No

8. If yes, which variables:

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer (more than one answer allowed).

Age

Disabilities

Race

Ethnicity

Sexuality

Other: _____

9. Are there other ministers or departments which focus on other discrimination variables than gender?
Please **highlight** or make a cross **X** at the right answer.

Yes

No

10. If yes, which ministers or departments?

Gender Equality Legislation

11. When was the first gender equality law introduced (pre&post 1945)?

Year: _____

12. When was the current gender equality law introduced?

Year: _____

13. Are there other laws with relevance for gender equality?

Please **highlight** or make a cross **X** at the right answer.

Yes

No

14. If yes, which laws?

15. Is the discrimination legislation for all areas placed within the same department or separated?

- a. If placed within the same department: Which areas are covered by the discrimination legislation, i.e. disabilities, race, ethnicity, sexuality

b. If separated: In which areas exist discrimination legislation?

16. Is there any cooperation between the departments and women's movements/NGOs?
Please **highlight** or make a cross **X** at the right answer.

Yes

No

17. If yes, which movements/NGOs?

18. Is there any cooperation with EU equality units?
Please **highlight** or make a cross **X** at the right answer.

Yes

No

19. If yes, which EU equality units?

Equality strategies - Gender mainstreaming:

The strategy of Gender mainstreaming was endorsed in 1995 at the Fourth World Conference in Beijing as a global equality strategy. In Europe the strategy has been implemented in the Amsterdam Treaty and in the National legislations.

20. What are the current priorities of gender equality policies? And of the latest action plan for gender equality?
List recent targeted issues of gender equality initiatives:

Give priority if possible

21. Has the word gender mainstreaming been applied in equality legislation?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

22. Has gender mainstreaming been a strategy in current /targeted initiatives?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

23. Has gender quotas been applied as a tool for gender equality?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

24. If yes, when and addressing which topic?

25. List any successful projects (good practices) relating to gender mainstreaming and other equality strategies, i.e. statistics, gender budgeting, gender action plans, minority integration plans etc.:

The European Year of Equality for All

2007 was launched as the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All. The Year sought to make people in the European Union more aware of their rights to equal treatment and to a life free of discrimination. The Year also launched a major debate on the benefits of diversity.

26. List activities in 2007 which concern matters of equality for all as part of the year:

27. What were the central issues?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer (more than one answer allowed).

Gender

Age

Disabilities

Race

Ethnicity

Sexuality

Other: _____

Gender mainstreaming – Equality mainstreaming

Where gender mainstreaming can be said to have its focus on gender issues, equality mainstreaming means a broader perspective on other discrimination issues, as for example age, disabilities, ethnicity etc.

28. Within which area does your unit/government relate to the issue of equality mainstreaming?

29. How does your government see equality mainstreaming?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer

As an impediment to gender mainstreaming

As a supplement to gender mainstreaming

Please indicate why and supplying comments:

We kindly request you to send us relevant legal and strategic documents – please enclose links of forward material:

Equality law document.

Recent campaigns – targeted issues.

Gender mainstreaming documents.

Equality mainstreaming documents and campaigns.

Please note that we welcome documents preferably in English but other European languages are welcome too!

Annex 5: Questionnaire – NGOs

QUESTIONNAIRE NGO's/movements

Contact information: Name of your NGO/movement, your country and e-mail address

Which type of movement or NGO is your organisation? Within which area does your organisation work, i.e. gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race etc?

When was your organisation/network started/founded?

Year: _____

3. What are the key issues and goals of your organisation?
Please list key issues and goals

4. Is your organisation cooperating with:

a. Other national NGO's or/and movements?
Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

If yes, which NGO's or/and movements?

b. Governmental units
Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

If yes, which governmental units?

c. EU
Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

If yes which EU/units organisations:

d. Other international organisations

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

If yes, which international organisations?

Equality strategies - Gender mainstreaming:

The strategy of Gender mainstreaming was endorsed in 1995 at the Fourth World Conference in Beijing as a global equality strategy. In Europe the strategy has been implemented in the Amsterdam Treaty and in the National legislations.

5. Has gender mainstreaming been a strategy/terminology in the regulations within your NGO/movement?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

6. List recent targeted issues of gender equality initiatives by your organisation, i.e. action plans, single issues etc.

Give priority if possible

7. Has gender mainstreaming been a strategy in current /targeted initiatives within your organisation?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

8. Has gender mainstreaming been a strategy in any recent initiatives within your organisation?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

9. Has gender quotas been applied as a demand or tool for gender equality by your organisation?
Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer.

Yes

No

10. If yes, when and within which area?

The European Year of Equality for All

2007 was the European Year of Equal Opportunities for All. The Year sought to make people in the European Union more aware of their rights to equal treatment and to a life free of discrimination. The Year also launched a major debate on the benefits of diversity.

11. List activities in 2007 which concern matters of Equality for All as part of the year:

12. What were the central issues?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer (more than one answer allowed).

Gender

Age

Disabilities

Race

Ethnicity

Sexuality

Other: _____

Gender mainstreaming – Equality mainstreaming

Where gender mainstreaming can be said to have its focus on gender issues, equality mainstreaming means a broader perspective on other discrimination issues, as for example age, disabilities, ethnicity etc.

13. How does your organisation relate to the issue of equality mainstreaming?

Please highlight or make a cross X at the right answer

As an impediment to gender mainstreaming

As a supplement to gender mainstreaming

Please indicate why and supplying comments:

We kindly request you to send us relevant strategic documents – please enclose links of forward material:

Regulations of your NGO/organisation

Programmes and strategic documents

Recent campaigns – targeted issues.

Equality mainstreaming documents and campaigns.

Please note that we welcome documents preferably in English but other European languages are welcome!

Annex 6: List of interviews

The EU Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities. Interview: January 2009

The European Women's Lobby (EWL). Interview: January 2010

Ms. Carolyn Hannan, Director of the Division for Advancement of women. UN. Interview: July 2009

The European Network Against Racism (ENAR). Interview: January 2010

The EU Parliament, MEP. Member of the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality.
Interview: January 2009

ILGA-Europe. Interview: September 2010.

AGE-Platform. Interview: September 2010.

Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, Germany. Interview: Maj 2010.

GenderKompetenzZentrum, Germany. Written interview: October 2008.

Deutscher Frauenrat, Germany. Interview: September 2008.

Österreichischer Frauenring, Austria. Interview: September 2008.

Bundesministerium für Finanzen/Working Group on Equal Treatment in the Ministry of Finance,
Austria. Interview: September 2008.

Departament ds. Kobiet, Rodziny i Przeciwdziałania Dyskryminacji. Poland. Interview: September
2008.

, Foundation for Women's Issues - I am Woman/FORUM 50+, Poland. Interview: September 2008.

Secretaría General de Políticas de Igualdad, Ministerio de Igualdad, Spain. Interview: June 2008.

CELEM, Spain. Interview: June 2008.

Annex 7: Collected reports and other material

Austria - NGO

"Protection against discrimination and gender equality – how to meet both requirements", Austrian Ombud for Equal Employment Opportunities, 2003.

"Women in Vienna", Municipal Department for the promotion and coordination of women's affairs.

"Planning recommendations for the gender-sensitive design of public parks", Municipal Department 42 Parks and Gardens.

Belgium - Government

"EGALITE ENTRE TRAVAILLEURS FEMININS ET MASCULINS

DROIT COMMUNAUTAIRE EUROPEEN/DROIT BELGE FEDERAL DOCUMENTATION DE BASE ♀ = ♂", Institut pour l'égalité des femmes et des hommes, 2008.

"Belgian law introducing the gender mainstreaming strategy into all federal policies",

Law of 17 January 2007, published on 13 February 2007

"7 MAI 1999. - Loi modifiant le Code judiciaire à l'occasion de la loi du 7 mai 1999 sur l'égalité de traitement entre hommes et femmes en ce qui concerne les conditions de travail, l'accès à l'emploi et aux possibilités de promotion, l'accès à une profession indépendante et les régimes complémentaires de sécurité sociale.", 1999.

"10 MAI 2007. - Loi tendant à lutter contre la discrimination entre les femmes et les hommes", 2007.

" PLAN DE MANAGEMENT ET PLAN OPÉRATIONNEL DU DIRECTEUR DE l'Institut pour l'égalité des femmes et des hommes", Institut pour l'égalité des femmes et des hommes.

Denmark - Government

"European Year of Equal Opportunities for All" (final rapport), Minister for Gender Equality, 2007

"Beskæftigelse, deltagelse og lige muligheder for alle – regeringens handlingsplan for at nedbryde kønsbestemte barrierer til uddannelse, arbejde og foreningslivet blandt

Kvinder og mænd med anden etnisk baggrund end dansk.", Danish Government, 2005.

"The Danish inter-ministerial gender mainstreaming project. Action plan 2002-2006. The new gender equality strategy", Minister for gender equality, 2002.

"The Danish inter-ministerial gender mainstreaming project. Action plan 2007-2011. The new gender equality strategy", Minister for gender equality, 2007.

"Bekendtgørelse af lov om ligestilling af kvinder og mænd, jf. lovbekendtgørelse nr. 1527 af 19. december 2004, med de ændringer, der følger af § 7 i lov nr. 574 af 24. juni 2005, lov nr. 452 af 22. maj 2006 og lov nr. 434 af 11. maj 2007."

"Direktiv 113/2004 er nu implementeret i lov om ligestilling af kvinder og mænd. Det betyder, at vi nu har klare definitioner for direkte og indirekte forskelsbehandling og for chikane og sexchikane. Læs gældende LOV nr 434 af 11/05/2007"

"Bekendtgørelse om initiativer til fremme af ligestilling er i 2007 gjort permanent. Bekendtgørelsen om initiativer til fremme af ligestilling gør det mindre bureaukratisk at arbejde mere aktivt med ligestilling. Bekendtgørelsen træder i kraft den 10. april 2007."

"Bekendtgørelse af lov om ligebehandling af mænd og kvinder med hensyn til beskæftigelse m.v. (1) LBK nr 734 af 28/06/2006 (Gældende)"

"Lov nr. 452 om Ændring af Lov om Ligestilling af kvinder og mænd Lov nr. 452 af 22. maj 2006."

"Bekendtgørelse af lov om lige løn til mænd og kvinder , LBK nr. 906 af 27/08/2006 (Gældende)"

"Lov om ligebehandling af mænd og kvinder inden for de erhvervstilknyttede sikringsordninger. Lovbekendtgørelse nr. 775 af 29. august 2001"

"Bekendtgørelse af valgfri protokol af 6. oktober 1999 til konventionen om afskaffelse af alle former for diskrimination imod kvinder."

"Det europæiske år for lige muligheder for alle – 2007", Ministeriet for ligestilling, 2008.

Denmark – NGO

"Seventh Periodic Report by the Government of Denmark on Implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.", Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Department Gender Equality, May 2008.

"Statutes for the Women's Council in Denmark", Women's Council, March 2006.

"Ligebehandling Status og fremtidsperspektiver", Institut for Menneskerettigheder. 2005"

"Letter to the president of the European Commission", Equal Treatment Committee, 2008.

Estonia – Government

"Gender Equality Act" April, 2004.

"National strategy and priorities for 2007 — EUROPEAN YEAR OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL – Estonia", 2007.

France – NGO

"Communiqué de presse (3 mai 2006) Du Mur de Berlin, Au Baisodrome du Mondial de foot", SoS-sexisme, May 2006.

"LE MATRONYME ACCOUCHE AU FORCEPS", Docteure Michèle Dayras, January 2005.

"Lettre aux Présidentiabiles de 2007 - Communiqué de SOS SEXISME", SoS-sexisme, January 2007.

"France : The transmission of women's surnames", Doctor Michèle Dayras, January 2005.

"Neither nude nor veiled", Doctor Michèle Dayras, July 2004.

"Prostitution, Pornographie et Traite des femmes", Doctor Michèle Dayras, June 2005.

"SOS SEXISM International Campaign (2001-2010)" Doctor Michèle Dayras.

"WOMEN ASK FOR COMPENSATION", Doctor Michèle Dayras.

Germany – Government

"Gesetz zur Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern in der Bundesverwaltung und in den Gerichten des Bundes (Bundesgleichstellungsgesetz - BLeiG)", Bundeministeriums der Justiz, 2001.

"Aktionsprogramm Perspektive Wiedereinstieg", Bundeministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend, 2008.

"Second Action Plan of the Federal Government to Combat Violence against Women", Federal ministry for family affairs, senior citizens, women and youth, November 2007.

"Portraits of men in transitions", Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth: http://bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/neue-wege-m_C3_A4nnerbrosch_C3_BCre-englisch.property=pdf,bereich=,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf

"Agreement between the Federal Government and the Central Associations of German Business on Promoting Equal Opportunities for Women and Men in the Private Sector of 2 July 2001": <http://bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/2.-bilanz-chancengleichheit-englisch-beiblatt.property=pdf,bereich=,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf>

"20 Year Old Women and Men Today - Life Plans, Role Models, Attitudes to Gender Equality",

A Qualitative Survey by Sinus Sociovision for the Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth Heidelberg, February 2007:

<http://bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/sinus-englisch.property=pdf,bereich=,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf>

"Health, Well Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany. A Representative Study of Violence against Women in Germany", Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth: <http://bmfsfj.de/bmfsfj/generator/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/Frauenstudie-englisch-Gewalt-gegen-Frauen.property=pdf,bereich=,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf>

"Working Aid Gender Impact Assessment "Gender Mainstreaming in the

Preparation of Legislation"", Federal ministry for family affairs, senior citizens, women and youth, May 2007.

"Sixth report, by the federal republic of Germany on the United Nations convention to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women (CEDAW)", Federal ministry for family affairs, senior citizens, women and youth.

"Leitfaden für gender mainstreaming in der legistik", Bundeskanzleramt Bundesministerium für Frauen, Medien und Öffentlichen Dienst, 2008.

"Aberitshilfe für Gender Budgetng in der Verwaltung", Bundeskanzleramt Bundesministerium für Frauen, Medien und Öffentlichen Dienst, 2007.

"Ist die Einkommensbesteuerung geschlechts-neutral" Bundesministerium für Finanzen, 2006.

Germany – NGO

"Leitsätze zum organisatorischen Selbstverständnis des Deutschen Frauenrates", Frauenrat, November 2005.

"The National Council of German Women's Organizations and its members", Deutscher Frauenrat.

"Satzung", Deutscher frauenrat, November 2007.

"Gender Budgeting as a Management Strategy for Gender Equality at Universities Concluding Project Report", Frauenakademie, 2008.

"Work Package 8 Analysis of the situation of women and men at the University of Augsburg Germany", Johanna Zebisch & Rebecca Mircea, April 2007.

"Work Package 8 Analysis of the situation of women and men at the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration Austria", Elisabeth Klatzer, Monika Mayrhofer, Michaela Neumayr, March 2007.

"Workpackage 8 Analysis of the situation of women and men at the University of Gdansk Poland" Sonia Bacha, Zofia Lapniewska, March 2007.

Hungary - Government

"Facilitating equal opportunities of women and men in adult education - Handbook", European Social Fund and Hungarian Government.

"Considering Gender – Handbook", European Social Fund and Hungarian Government.

"National Strategy and Priorities for 2007 — EUROPEAN YEAR OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL Hungary", 2007.

"MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete A diszkrimináció öt (nemi, faji vagy etnikai származás, vallás vagy meggyőződés, fogyatékoság, életkor) területén eddig párhuzamosan folyó kutatások eredményeinek feltárása, összegzése Magyarországon Szakmai beszámoló", January 2008.

More reports on: <http://www.szmm.gov.hu/main.php?folderID=16291>

Ireland – Government

"The Equality Authority Annual Rapport 2007", The Equality Authority, 2007.

"Strategic Plan 2006-2008 – embedding equality", The Equality Authority, January 2006.

"The employment equality acts 1998 and 2004", The Equality Authority.

"Rapport of activities in Ireland under the European year of equal opportunities for all 2007 and a proposed legacy from this European year", The Equality Authority, May 2008.

"The equal status acts 2000 to 2004", The Equality Authority.

"National Women's Strategy 2007 – 2016", Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, April 2007.

"Effective Social Policy: Promoting Gender Equality in the Irish National Development Plan 2000-2006", NDP Gender Equality Unit of the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, January 2008.

"DEGREES OF EQUALITY: GENDER PAY DIFFERENTIALS AMONG RECENT GRADUATES", THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE DUBLIN, 2005.

"Ireland's Combined Second and Third Reports under the UN convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women", Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, February 1997.

"Ireland's Combined Second and Third Reports under the UN convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women", Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, May 2003.

More reports on: <http://www.justice.ie>

Latvia – Government

"Regarding the Programme for Implementation of Gender Equality 2007-2010, cabinet order", Ministry of Welfare, 2007.

"Labour Law", Latvian Parliament, 2004.

"Capacity Building for Institutions Involved In and Responsible For Developing Employment and Gender Equality Policy (2004-2007)", European Social Fund.

Lithuania – Government

Rapports on gendermainstreaming in Lithuanian: <http://www.socmin.lt/index.php?1188848767>

Luxembourg – Government

"Convention sur l'élimination de toutes les formes de discrimination à l'égard des femmes CEDAW 5e rapport périodique du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg", Ministère de l'Égalité des chances, 2006

Luxembourg – NGO

"Projet de loi No 5739", Conseil National des Femmes du Luxembourg, 2007

"L'égalité entre femmes et hommes Élément essentiel du développement économique durable et de la cohésion sociale", April 2008.

"Résolution Conseil National des Femmes du Luxembourg", Conseil National des Femmes du Luxembourg, 2008.

"Eliminating female genital mutilation – an interagency statement", WHO, 2008.

"Présentation Le CONSEIL NATIONAL DES FEMMES DU LUXEMBOURG", Conseil National des Femmes du Luxembourg.

"Étude sur la publicité sexiste au Luxembourg", Conseil National des Femmes du Luxembourg, 2006 (Campaign material from sexist commercials in Luxembourg).

Malta – Government

"Constitution of Malta", September 1964.

"Employment and industrial relations act", December 2002.

"Equality for women and men act", December 2003.

Norway – Government

"The act relating to Gender Equality", Ministry of Children and Equality, law published 2005.

The Act on the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud and the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Tribunal (The Anti-Discrimination Ombud Act). Ministry of children and equality, 2005.

Norway – NGO

"VEDTEKTER OG STYRESAMMENSETNING - Vedtekter for MiRA Ressurscenter for innvandrere- og flyktningkvinner", MiRA resource centre, January 1996"

Poland – Government

"Report on the implementation of the European year of equal opportunities for all 2007 – Poland", 2008.

"Diagnosis of the social and professional situation of rural women in Poland", Ministry of labour and social policy, department of women, family and counteracting discrimination, 2008.

"Podrecznik", Ministry of labour and social policy, department of women, family and counteracting discrimination, 2007.

"Moje prawu w pracy!", Ministry of labour and social policy, department of women, family and counteracting discrimination, 2006.

"Kim jestesmy", Ministry of labour and social policy, department of women, family and counteracting discrimination, 2002.

"Elastyczne zatrudnienie", Ministry of labour and social policy, department of women, family and counteracting discrimination, 2007.

"Poszukiwana 45+", Ministry of labour and social policy, department of women, family and counteracting discrimination.

"Przewodnik dobrych praktyk Firma rownych szans" 2007.

CD-ROM: "Kobieta aktywne w srodowisku lokalnym, praca zbiorowa", Akademia Kobiet Aktywnych.

Poland – NGO

"Active Presence – International Day of the Elderly" Forum 50+, October 2005.

"Statut Polskiego Forum Osób Niepełnosprawnych", Polish Disability Forum, 2007.

"Glos Osob Starszych Sila Prazyszlosci!" Forum 50+, 2006.

"Podrecznik Wladzy", Foundation for Women's Issues.

"Spoleczno-ekonomiczne konteksty sukcesu zawodowego kobiet 2006" Foundation for Womens Issues, 2006.

"Counteracting discrimination on the grounds of race, ethnic origin, religion and belief, age and sexual orienteation" Department for Women, Family and counteracting discrimination, 2006.

"Who We Are", Department for Women, Family and Counteracting Discrimination, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2006.

Slovakia – Government

"Constitution of the Slovak Republic (excerpt) The act on public defenders rights", December 2001.

"The Act on Equal Treatment in Some Areas and on Protection against Discrimination and on Changes and Amendments to Some Regulations (the Antidiscrimination Act)", April 2008.

Slovenia – Government

Material in Slovenian: <http://www.uem.gov.si/>

Slovenia – NGO

"WOMEN'S LOBBY SLOVENIA WORK PROGRAMME 2007". Slovenian Women's Lobby, 2007.

Rapports from the Peace Institute can be found here: http://www.mirovni-institut.si/Kategorija/Detail/en/kategorija/Human_rights/sekcija/publikacije/

Spain – NGO

"Un Modelo activo para favorecer la igualdad en el mundo laboral 2005-2007", Celem 2007.

"System of indications nad variables on geder violence based on which to build the database of the national observatory on violence against women", Ministerio De Trabajo Y Asuntos Sociales.

CD-ROM: Ministerio De TrabajoY Asuntos Sociales, Act 3/2007 gender equalities, Act 1/2004 voilence, Act 30/2003 gender impact assessment, National plan against violence, Indication and variables.

CD-ROM: Work Flexibility, Corporate social responsibility, women and development initiatives and strategies for enterprising women.

Sweden - NGO

“Principles and Policies – RFSU”, The association for Sexuality Education, 2003.

”CONSTITUTION of The Swedish Association for Sex Education (RFSU)” 1999.

Material from the European Women’s Lobby

“European Women’s Lobby Annual report 2007”, European W