



# Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development



## *Report on Asia Consultation on Gender and Development Effectiveness. Coordinated by APWLD on behalf of Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness.*

### **Section 1: Introduction**

26 participants (24 women and 2 men) from 23 national and regional organisations attended the workshop. Representation included migrant workers, women's rights, disability rights, and civil society umbrella organisations, indigenous and rural women. Representatives from the Thailand offices of two European CSOs were invited as observers to have direct interaction with the perspectives of their Southern counterparts. A full list of participants is contained in Annex A.

This report follows the chronology of the consultation, from articulating a shared understanding/ analysis of the principles and their implications from a gender perspective, to considering the requirements relating to Gender Equity within: Institutional Practices of CSOs and CSO Programmes and Movements; and the factors required of donors and governments to provide an Enabling Environment for women's rights. See Annex B for the Programme. The report is based on the discussions at the consultation, and the first draft was enhanced by review by the participants and several other network members who were unable to attend.

### **Section 2: A gender perspective on the Open Forum Process and the Istanbul Principles**

*There is a need for greater attention to the requirements and contexts of marginalised groups.*

There is a concern that we are institutionalising a framework of funding, governments and CSOs that excludes and further marginalises many groups that already have a small voice and are undertaking contentious work – ie especially when pointing out to government what they ought to be doing, or taking positions contrary to major development actors. As it is, CSOs face significant challenges in obtaining funds, and those working 'in the margins' or in highly politicised environments want reassurance that the Open Forum process is helping to strengthen their voices rather than further marginalise them and their constituencies.

*There is room for improvement* in the genuine inclusion of women's (particularly marginalised women's) voices in the lead-up to Busan (i.e. integrating women's perspective across all the processes, in addition to holding women-specific consultations). One example is the Labour Rights consultation which failed to include migrant workers who have largely fallen outside of trade union/ ILO constituencies.

*On the preamble to the Principles:* In defining CSOs there is a need to encompass the diversity while maintaining the space for people's movements and organisations. The inclusion of bodies such as Chambers of Commerce is problematic, inserting potentially divergent interests and reducing the focus on human rights outcomes. Regarding the definition of CSOs as non-partisan and non-violent – CSOs depending on their political context, cannot avoid being involved in politics. For example in the

Philippines CSOs have started building their own parties as the mainstream ones have not addressed the interests of the marginalised. Regarding 'non-violent' in the preamble – violence can have many definitions, and marginalised groups are subjected to different forms of violence. The term non-violence should be further qualified.

*Moving from values to action.*

It was emphasized that without the capacity for operational action, the principles are meaningless and for true implementation there are many implications for women's and non-women's organisations, from the presence of cultural norms and stereotypes, to the resources required to realise the ideals. Hence there is a vital link to the enabling environment, as there is a requirement for donors and governments to commit to these Principles meaningfully. Donors must recognise the resource needs for CSOs in implementing good practices in operations and programmes; and embody them in the way that they interact with communities and people's organisations.

The Open Forum is recognised as an important process, and an opportune time for CSOs to reflect inwardly on genuine accountability to women, but we should not lose sight of the bigger picture about reshaping the aid architecture, to give women greater access to and control over resources.

## **The Principles**

*1. Respect and promote human rights and social justice:* The presence of cultural norms and gender stereotypes that continue to prevail in communities where many CSOs are operating was identified as a key constraint to gender equity within CSOs and their work, and to the Principle of human rights and social justice. When women are constrained by prevailing attitudes as to what women and girls can and cannot or should not do, it is challenging in terms of taking the principles "from values to action". The presence of patriarchal practices within NGOs is not adequately recognised in the Principles. Examples of gender stereotypes even within human rights organisations included women activists being asked to prepare tea, cook for male activists, and take notes at meetings. Cultural conditions / gender stereotypes were identified as needing attention at every level of the development effectiveness debate, from within CSOs and people's movements, to donors and the ways and methods they choose to allocate funds, to the role of governments in creating and enforcing structural barriers to women. When allocations go directly to Government there are risks that the human rights of marginalised women are not addressed.

*2. Embody gender equality and equity while promoting women and girls' rights:* The needs of marginalised people should be central to the implementation of all of the principles, and in particular Principle 2, it is essential to consider marginalised groups within the women's movement, such as migrant women workers, indigenous women, women with disabilities, LGBTI women and women in situations of conflict and forced displacement. Diversity amongst women and the intersectionality of women's identities needs to be highlighted more strongly and CSOs need to build their own capacity to be more inclusive.

*Women and women's  
development concerns cannot  
be put into 1 basket*

*3. Focus on people's empowerment, democratic ownership and participation:* Democratic ownership over policies and development initiatives should be applied in all stages of producing laws and policies (from conceptualization to implementation) and engage all sectors *giving preference to marginalised people including disabled persons*. It should also require promoting internationally-accepted good governance principles. This can be done when the people are organised and women have their rightful place as partners in leadership and in all the different aspects of organisational operations.

The terms ‘democratic ownership’ and ‘citizen’ are problematic for groups such as undocumented migrants, refugees, and stateless people and minority groups (eg. Sri Lanka Sinhala and the Tamil conflict) who have least recourse through formal avenues to claim their rights. Again, before channeling funds to Governments donors should undertake critical analysis of the barriers to equal participation of diverse groups.

*4. Promote Environmental Sustainability:*

The text for Principle 4 should include “promote viable traditional/indigenous knowledge and practices on environmental sustainability and strengthen the role of rural and indigenous women in these processes”.

CSOs are concerned what burden this Principle may place on them in going about their work – especially regional organisations who rely on travel. There is potential for donors and CSOs to work constructively on this issue, for example donors can promote sustainability through supporting environmental impact assessments with realistic parameters that don’t constrain CSOs operations.

In addition to sustainability, environmental safety is an important issue for particularly rural and indigenous women in the face of government-supported development or commercial projects. An example was shared of a radio transmission centre in North West Sri Lanka, around which the local communities are reporting significant health implications including increased rates of spontaneous abortions and birth defects that so far go unacknowledged.

*5. Practice transparency and accountability:* The statement – ‘accountability to regional bodies’ etc poses a security danger in not recognising groups that work outside or contrary to mainstream power structures. By implying accountability to donors and government, the guidelines pose a danger to people’s movements (such as migrant groups, working with undocumented people) and activists – for example in the Philippines association with particular organisations can lead to becoming a target for political dangers. In Sri Lanka, human rights activists are threatened, particularly women. Tactics include white vans without number plates visiting the homes of activists in the night time; names given to embassies so that activists are refused visas and cannot travel, or are required to go through extraordinary hoops to obtain permits. Since 2010 all NGOs and CSOs are registered under the Defense Ministry (as opposed to previously the Social Services Department), and are at heightened risk of de-registration by the Government.

After the word Transparency, it could say: “with respect to valuing right to privacy, confidentiality and self-determination if requested by the affected communities”. In some contexts, transparency may endanger the communities we work with, e.g. undocumented migrants, victims.

CSOs need to take this Principle critically: some accountabilities need to be prioritised or challenged, e.g. Self Help Group organisers may be more accountable to banks than to beneficiaries. Accountability to beneficiaries should outweigh accountability to donors. Also, many CSOs operate in environments where there is no Right to Information legislation, and accountability to CSOs and their constituencies are lacking.

*6: Pursue equitable partnerships and solidarity:* Equitable partnerships and solidarity –it is too easy for this to be token solidarity. CSOs have communicated that when government and donors request input from CSOs they give it, but there is not adequate feedback (i.e. genuine two-way engagement) on how the information is being used. Within the CSO community it equally applies that organisations should be prepared for ongoing engagement (partnership) with constituencies that they target for information/

perspectives. As for partnership with governments, often in the region CSOs are not considered development partners and face targeting by authorities and police in conducting campaigns.

Suggestions to build solidarity include mapping of CSOs working on gender concerns to find opportunities for collaboration – peer-peer exchanges or exposure visits. In order to achieve positive, sustainable change, development actors have to address the roots of the problem. It's the role of institutions to conduct political analysis of the issues and respond not just to the immediate need on a service delivery basis without social justice perspective.

Re partnerships and solidarity – often donors and government implement without knowing what the community needs. Development actors should carry out need assessment and consultation with the concerned women and communities when projects are being planned, and not rely solely on information from particular vested interests.

*7. Create and share knowledge and commit to mutual learning:*

There are rich exchanges in the daily interactions of CSOs. The question is what is realistic to expect CSOs to document in relation to being a valid use of their time and not exerting undue burdens – particularly at the grassroots level.

We need to advocate donors and government to recognise the principles – ie beyond recognitions, CSOs, donors and governments if they are committed they need to go beyond recognition to practice. Ie can't limit your role to just providing money or services – this was a theme in programmatic as well – to identify and address women's human rights, have women's rights as human rights as a central tenet and identify and address violations of women's human rights.

*8. Commit to realising positive sustainable change:* Sustainable change in relation to women's human rights is a long-term goal and movements should actively build the capacity of new feminists and activists, and strengthen networks between movements.

The realisation of this principle requires the centrality of gender equality across all aspects of development and within all the 7 other principles.

*“Exclusion of women prevents sustainability and effective development”*

### Section 3: CSOs Embodying Gender Equity and Equality in Institutional Practices

CSOs discussed the direction of accountability and the need to ensure that in implementing the principles, the primary focus is on accountability to our constituencies, and on establishing meaningful and realistic processes and mechanisms for CSOs to achieve accountability for gender equity. As such the Principles are taken as a guiding framework for effective development which CSOs should be able to adapt according to their needs and priorities, with a key understanding that gender equality is cross-cutting and not merely a stand-alone set of indicators. This raises a whole area of resources which for CSOs to implement requires recognition and commitment from donors.

An area not considered in-depth due to time constraints, is the practical implications of differing capacity and resources between organisations to implement 'best practice'. It remains a challenge to define how we can be specific yet realistic in having indicators that allow CSOs to go through a process of becoming more inclusive of women rather than expecting large changes overnight. The discussion highlighted the need to be aware of not setting CSOs up for unrealistic expectations from donors and others.

#### **Considering Guidelines, Mechanisms and practical applications (Indicators) for CSOs to promote gender equity in their Institutional Practices, CSOs provided the following recommendations:**

##### *Build conceptual clarity.*

Build capacity within organisations on substantive gender equality so that CSOs are informed and act with an understanding of the implications. This was raised consistently in relation to Institutional Practices, programme/ movement and Enabling Environment. The capacity needs to be holistic, and cover all levels of organisations in depth – for example it is not enough only for one person to attend a training, but the awareness and approach need to be internalised throughout the structures of CSOs, and once internalized, to be fed into grassroots memberships – for regional organisations.

##### *Address structural barriers to the full participation of women in CSOs*

Existing discriminations (barriers) must be addressed through mechanisms to promote women's full participation. CSOs need to be proactive in providing effective spaces for women to participate, and develop built in mechanisms to put the guidelines into practice. Supporting women's participation means understanding the factors that impact women's ability to participate, e.g. women's existing heavy workloads/gendered roles including as mothers and carers; practical considerations where women are not safe out at night.

*“How can women discriminated against at home and in the workplace, talk about women's empowerment in the community and society?”*

In proposing the following recommendations, the consultation clearly emphasised:

- That recommendations for measures need to be matched with context and capacity, and the importance of avoiding 'one size fits all' or generic measures.
- Principles and guidelines should ultimately aim to increase the power of marginalised women,
- Being aware of women's relative power/lack of power in different contexts.

CSOs should take into account the practical barriers experienced by women – e.g. through providing crèche facilities in the organisation where possible, incorporating child minding facility into programme budgets so that participants can bring dependent children. The provision of flexible working hours to account for women's other duties such as taking children to school, cooking or caring for family

members. These measures are not to ignore the need to challenge unequal sharing of home duties between men and women, but acknowledge the realities posed for women by entrenched social norms. In mixed organisations CSOs may be able to model shared gender responsibilities through considering both maternity and paternity provisions. Benefits such as Health Plans should include dependents, and incorporate a broad definition of family (eg same-sex partners). The provision of translators would remove language as a barrier or excuse for having only men participate (due to more opportunity to learn English).

Spaces are needed within CSOs for women to break their silence. Potential indicators include the presence of Anti-discrimination policies, inclusive not protectionist in nature, (e.g equal opportunity; anti-sexual harassment) so that women have avenues to address sexual harassment, gender-based violence etc in CSOs.

Regular gender awareness capacity building provided for women and men, so that staff develop increased consciousness and reflect this in institutional and programme aspects. Job descriptions should have a gender dimension. Gender focal points for mainstreaming gender sensitivity and a gender sensitive checklist for staff to use. Undertake regular monitoring for gender sensitivity – applies both to programme and institutional aspects.

*Practice Transparency and Accountability:*

Implement mechanisms for consultation with staff in decision-making, such as recording decisions of management and governance, sharing information. Specific mechanisms to support participatory decision-making (including policy development etc) such as monthly meetings where all staff are free to table agenda items. Transparent approach reflected in the presence and utilisation of organisational policies, from financial management to rules and procedures.

*To promote women's leadership, CSOs can:*

Provide opportunities for relevant training and skills building, planned with specific considerations that enable women's participation. Recognise and harness women's existing knowledge and skills. Bring in and empower young women activists. Strengthen networks across the women's movement, including marginalised groups such as women with disabilities, LGBTI groups, migrant workers, indigenous women. Implement transparent affirmative action policies and actively promote women's inclusion in staff, management and governance levels. To be understood in qualitative and not simply quantitative representation.

*Pursue Equitable Partnerships and Solidarity*

The guideline should explicitly state women's participation in decision-making and standard setting for Partnership Agreements.

The idea of the Partnership Agreement "needs to ensure that it is free from bureaucratic, hierarchal, economic and socio-cultural structures that prevent women's initiatives and those in the marginalised sectors".

#### Section 4: What do CSOs need to do to be effective in promoting gender equality through their work and movements?

##### *Embody Gender Equity*

Traditional leaders and institutions across the CSO spectrum need to embrace and accept women's rights and bring women's rights issues to the center of their agenda and movements.

Funding allocations and program strategies should reflect a commitment to gender equality, both in being targeted to women's issues and through accountability to analyse impacts from a transformational perspective - whether empowerment is really occurring.

The growing dominance of economic development programs as a model for women's empowerment raises a need for significant reflection by CSOs. The micro-credit approach appears an easy response for governments and NGOs who link economic development to women's empowerment but often the impacts for women have not been adequately assessed. At grassroots level women say they need income - for children's education, transport etc.

Not discounting there is a place for economic development initiatives but there needs to be proper monitoring and critique of the value systems behind the models – and this applies equally to all programmes addressing women's needs. To achieve greater scrutiny and analysis there is a need for capacity building from grassroots level NGOs to 'donor CSOs' to strengthen the focus on empowerment outcomes.

*“Development should not be measured economically – other areas of empowerment should be considered”*

##### *Implications for women of 'women's' programs – Microfinance Initiatives example<sup>1</sup>*

- Despite the rhetoric, often members of microfinance groups (Self Help Groups) do not engage collectively, but take on individual burdens.
- Research has found many economic development projects contribute more to consumption than to productive activities.
- The vested interests of the providers of micro-credit (from governments, to banks, to multinational corporations, religious institutions, and NGOs) are often divergent with or lacking a human rights approach. There needs to be greater attention to situations of exploitation and a stronger voice for women's advocates looking at what is the real goal/ accountability of bringing women together.
- Self Help Groups that only focus on micro-credit has depoliticised feminist ideologies. The space is reduced only to savings and giving money – not reflection on gender-based violence, etc. Members cannot take a strong political stand and struggle for their social and political rights.
- Now it is part of women's job, to procure loans, giving women a greater burden – taking care of house and family, responsibility for income generation, while men's responsibility has shrunk.
- Often marginalised women become further marginalised.

*“In the last month in Vellu, Tamil Nadu, we have seen 6 suicides by women from pressure from MFIs”*

<sup>1</sup> The case study is based on “Engendering Development: Accountability of Non-Governmental Organisations on Gender Issues”, report from a 2005 research project carried out by Initiatives: Women in Development. Esther Beulah Devakumari was a key member of the research team and presented the case study. The purpose of the research, which covered over 300 NGOs including women's and non-women's specific organisations, NGOs headed by women and men, etc; was to assess the real impacts for women from the high level of funding being allocated ostensibly for women's development; and explore the gendered dimensions of women's experiences within NGOs.

*Commit to realising positive sustainable change:*

For sustainable change, CSOs need to take a social justice approach to their work, from engaging with communities to understand the roots of the issues, to advocacy and service delivery. People's movements need to take a politically informed stand on women's issues. Identifying women's rights violations and consciously addressing them (i.e. explicitly stating women's rights in organisational missions, values and programme strategies) indicate that a group is promoting gender equality by analyzing and challenging the causes.

Initiate and build spaces for cross learning among movements. Indicators: Mentorship for new feminist leadership within movements; human rights movement has adequate qualitative and quantitative representation of women.

*Principle 4: Promote Environmental Sustainability – CSOs need to incorporate women's perspective.*

Women, particularly rural and indigenous women, are highly experienced in managing natural resources, bringing valuable knowledge that should be harnessed through bottom-up processes. The implementing guidelines for this Principle should recognise the central importance of harnessing traditional knowledge and skills, particularly that of women.

Women's role in sustaining their environment; their family's wellbeing and their health, are threatened by environmental degradation and by the practices of development actors entering communities and failing to consult with women and recognise their resilience in natural disasters and climate events (e.g. being seed keepers and knowing how to adapt crops to climate conditions).

Women's access to and control over resources are removed by CSOs and others (for example entities in public-private partnerships) engaging in practices that fail to adequately include women in decision-making as required in international agreements. The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples for example, gives a clear directive for free, prior and informed consent. When donors or others only consult with men, or give inadequate attention to meaningful and inclusive representation of women, they fail to meet their obligations under international standards.

*Principle 5: Practice Transparency and Accountability*

CSOs are primarily accountable, financially and more broadly, towards our constituencies. This includes making available financial and annual reports showing the resources coming in, work implemented and results. Provision of public information via websites, list serves, audio visuals (videos), reports etc, accessible to women of different abilities, and available in different languages.

*Pursue equitable partnerships and solidarity; create and share knowledge and mutual learning.*

Strengthening strategic alignment between CSOs through building strong CSO networks and collaboration. Mapping of concerns of CSOs working on gender concerns, peer-to-peer exchange, community outreach and exposure seeking to expand network membership and joint program collaborations.

Indicators of mutual accountability and true partnership towards gender equity between CSOs (eg North and South) are equity in decision making, meaningful involvement, and gender-sensitive content in Partnership Agreements.

Engage directly with donors and governments to increase their recognition of true empowerment – provide awareness raising and exposure to our work for increased likelihood of government and donors supporting initiatives from the CSO perspective rather than donor's perspective.

Report on Asia Consultation on Gender and Development Effectiveness. Coordinated by APWLD on behalf of Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness. April 2011

Promote and provide safety at work, including by providing spaces where women speak out in and outside the movement, and protecting the safety and security of women human rights defenders and women leaders.

**Section 5: What is required for an Enabling Environment for effective development where: women are decision makers, active participants (i.e. not just implementing) and women are beneficiaries. What are the legal, bureaucratic, informational, political, cultural and behavioural requirements from governments and donors?**

*CSOs in Asia Pacific call on Governments of Aid Receiving Countries to:*

Create an environment where women's rights are respected and promoted, including:

- Take a role in promoting cultural changes to institutionalise respect for women's human rights through measures such as incorporating gender equality into the curriculum in basic education.
- Abolish protectionist policies – for example when in Fiji women have dress codes to protect them from being assaulted, the approach should be instead to conduct programs to change men's behaviour.
- Support women in organising for their rights – for example women in communities and migrant workers.
- Take responsibility for the rights of migrants, undocumented and 'stateless' people: Undocumented workers should be allowed to press charges (many countries don't allow, with Korea being one exception given). Protect women marriage migrants and their children. Enact child protection laws.
- Pass and implement law on gender equality in workplaces, in policy and decision making bodies, and amend election laws to ensure women's equal participation in politics.

Recognise and Support Civil Society efforts and mandates, including:

- Abolish patriarchal law and policies from property rights, to protecting the rights of women in unregistered marriages, bride kidnapping and arranged marriage.
- Make legislation regarding CSO registration progressive. Registration is a common impediment to CSO's ability to operate. One example of hindering legislation was that board members of Thai organisations are required to demonstrate their responsible nature by demonstrating property ownership – which would be an impediment to the representation of women in governance structures.
- Provide policy support for CSOs to raise funds and mobilise local and international resources.
- Demonstrate political will to include meaningful participation of women and their organisations in decision making, by implementing a national framework of policies and programs to ensure this.

Observe international agreements and commitments to protect human rights. Too often repressive governments use the concept of national sovereignty to commit Human Rights violations against their own people. Human rights should still prevail over national sovereignty. Although not discussed in-depth due to time constraints, the issue of donors considering states' track record in implementing women's rights before giving them money was briefly touched on but no consensus was reached –“conditionality ... is problematic particularly for women's rights where there are many conflicting ideas about what's best for women and who gets to determine what's best”.

*CSOs in Asia Pacific call on Donors (states, multilateral agencies, donor CSOs) to:*

Address structural inequities in the global funding environment:

- The Paris Declaration focus on providing support through national systems (i.e. states) neglects the place of civil society both as a recipient for aid money and for a stakeholder in setting aid priorities. Bilateral donors largely give funding to states or to multi-lateral agencies, which compete with civil society for access to resources (one specific example given was that the Australian government recently gave a large amount to the International Labour Organisation, at the expense of regional

civil society initiatives targeted at the most marginal migrant workers). The financial practices of multi-lateral agencies, including large salaries and per diems and highly paid consultants often from the global North, are at odds with the requirements for financial accountability placed on CSOs, and reduce the small proportion remaining to be channeled to CSO activities.

- Human rights CSOs and particularly women's rights organisations are experiencing increasing resistance from donors to fund social transformation programmes. The growing focus on achieving quantifiable outcomes (focusing on numbers of women) within neat timeframes is at odds with a commitment to support long-term change for women.
- Southern CSOs would like to see more funding made directly available, rather than channeled through multi-lateral agencies or Northern CSOs.
- Bring substance to the rhetoric of 'partnership' (particularly donor CSOs) by addressing existing power hierarchies: creating formal space for genuine dialogue with Southern CSOs, joint setting of programme strategies and priorities with particular attention to including the voices of women, and being prepared to learn from the experience and perspectives of Southern counterparts.

*“The Aid effectiveness debate is not about adequate resources – it is about who has control over our resources.”*

Demonstrate commitment to supporting women by:

- Implementing democratic practices including enabling (funding) participation of women's groups in consultations; represent women's agendas and take steps to address internal power / discrimination structures when entering communities.
- Take a policy approach to meeting women's needs including being prepared to fund and support specific measures such as breastfeeding facilities, crèche services (within CSO operations and in programme activities); women's capacity building and networking.
- Support CSOs to have accountability mechanisms including the capacity to provide access to information to diverse women (websites, annual reports in accessible languages and formats).
- Take women's perspectives into account when setting programme strategies. Programmes should not be driven by donor priorities in isolation from full and inclusive participation of women, particularly marginalised women.
- Increase the proportion of funding that is made available to women's programmes.
- Undertake critical analysis of development initiatives to determine whether empowerment or reinforced discrimination is occurring. Make opportunities to learn directly from women.
- Adopt a gender equity approach and reject moral policing and protectionist policies. “We need to say No to Moral Policing if we are really committed to creating an enabling environment for gender equity”.
- Implement realistic and meaningful reporting requirements. There is an overemphasis of donors on outputs, as opposed to qualitative achievements. Grassroots groups find donor requirements becoming more complicated with increasing requirements for analytical skills, technology etc, making it even harder for rural and grassroots groups to access funding.
- The commitment should be demonstrated by the impact on women's political participation.

*The move away from Core Funding is diminishing CSO Effectiveness*

- Project-based funding reduces the economic and job security of CSO staff, leaving CSOs struggling to pay operating costs and unable to provide social security, insurance for their staff, benefits that the organisations are promoting as human rights. Project-based funding also brings disproportionate

burdens of reporting and unrealistic expectations on CSOs, detracting from their accountability to constituents, and reduces their ability to respond to emerging grassroots needs.

- Core funding is essential to provide organisations the flexibility to provide job security for women and men; and implement the range of policies and practices that have been identified as enabling women's participation. Women human rights and community development activists, many of whom are single or single mothers and enjoy little financial security, deserve economic justice to support them in carrying out their work.

## Annex A: List of Participants

Mr. Saroeun SOEUNG	Cooperation Committee for Cambodia (CCC)	Cambodia
Ms Vong Nov	NGO Forum on Cambodia	Cambodia
Edwina Kotoisuva	Fiji Women's Crisis Centre	Fiji
Cynthia Ca Abdon-Tellez	The Mission for Migrant Workers	Hong Kong
Mr. Aaron Ceradoy,	Asia Pacific Mission for Migrants (APMM)	Hong Kong
Esther Beulah Devakumari	Emmaus Community Welfare Fund ECOMWEL	India
Kamala Chandrakirana (Nana)		Indonesia
Yuni Chuzaifah	Komnas Perempuan	Indonesia
Titiek Hendrastiti	Koalisi Perempuan	Indonesia
Mikiko Otani		Japan
Olga Djanaeva	Rural Women's NGO 'Alga'	Kyrgyzstan
Vivian Chong	CARAM Asia	Malaysia
Urantsooj GOMBOSUREN (Urna)	Center for Human Rights and Development	Mongolia
Azra Sayeed	ROOTS for Equity	Pakistan
Elisa Tita Lubi	Gabriela	Philippines
Vernie Yocogan-Diano	Innabuyog	Philippines
Lyn Angelica D. Pano	Asia Pacific Research Network (APRN)	Philippines
Ava Danlog	IBON/ROA	Philippines
Chona Sabo	Disabled Peoples' International Asia-Pacific Region(DPI/AP)	Thailand
Sureeporn Yupa	Disabled Peoples' International Asia-Pacific Region(DPI/AP)	Thailand
Nang Hearn	Women's League of Burma (WLB)/ SWAN	Thailand
Shimreichon Luithui	Asia Indigenous People's Pact (AIPP)	Thailand
Lucia Victor Jayaseelan	Committee for Asian Women (CAW)	Thailand
Julie Ham	Global Alliance Against Traffic in Women (GAATW)	Thailand
Dana Meads	APWLD	Thailand
Tina Lee	AWPLD	Thailand
<b>Observers:</b>		
Vanessa Chong	Diakonia	Thailand
Masud Hossain	KEPA	Thailand

<b>Unable to attend but provided input following:</b>		
Nurgul Djanaeva	Forum of Women's NGOs of Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyzstan
Geetha Fernando	National Fisheries Solidarity Movement (NAFSO)	Sri Lanka

## Annex B: Programme

### Consultation on Gender in Asia: "Gender Equity and Development Effectiveness" 1st - 2nd March 2011 Chiang Mai, Thailand

#### Program

##### Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> March

11.30 am	Registration Open
<b>12.00 – 1.00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
1.00 – 2.00	Consultation Open Welcome and Introductions
2.00 – 3.00	Consultation Objectives, and Background
<b>3.00 – 3.15</b>	<b>Tea Break</b>
3.15 – 3.45	Istanbul Principles for Development Effectiveness (Presentation)
3.45 - 4.15	Case Study of research by Initiatives: Women in Development (India)
4.15 – 5.45	Experiences of good and poor practices relating to gender equity

##### Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> March

9.00 – 9.15	Re-cap from Day 1 and Introduction to Day 2
9.15 – 11.30 (includes tea break)	Group Work: Developing <i>Principles</i> and practical applications ( <i>Indicators</i> ) for CSOs to promote gender equity in their <u>Institutional Practices</u>
11.30 – 1.00	Group Work: Developing <i>Indicators</i> for CSOs to promote gender equality in the way they implement their <u>Programmes and Movements</u>
<b>1.00 – 2.00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
2.00 – 3.30	What is required for an <u>Enabling Environment</u> to promote CSO efforts towards gender equity? Presentation, followed by groups developing recommendations.
<b>3.30 – 3.45</b>	<b>Tea Break</b>
3.45 – 4.45	'Open Space' - for dialogue on outstanding issues identified by participants.
4.45 – 5.45	Synthesis and Evaluation