

PC.DEL/941/04
30 September 2004

ENGLISH only

To: All Delegations
Secretariat

Please find attached the summary of the meeting of the **Informal Working Group on Gender Equality and Anti-Trafficking** held on 20 September 2004.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Amb. Kongshem, Dr. Gracheva', followed by a smaller, more stylized signature.

Amb. Kongshem, Dr. Gracheva
Co-Chairs of the Group

**Summary
of the meeting of the Informal Working Group
on Gender Equality and Anti-Trafficking**

20 September 2004

*Co-chairs: Ambassador Mette Kongshem (NORWAY)
Dr. Vera Gracheva (RUSSIAN FEDERATION)*

1. Finalization of the Draft 2004 Action Plan for the Promotion of Gender Equality

The Co-Chair (RF) noted that a final draft of the 2004 Action Plan for the Promotion of Gender Equality (2004 AP) was near completion and she hoped that it could be finalized that day. *The Co-Chair (Norway)* hoped that it could be forwarded to the Preparatory Committee and then to the PC for adoption. She noted that the revised text (PC.DEL/95/04/Rev.6) was, with the exception of some editorial changes and amendments to the section on Training (paragraphs 11-13), the same as the version of 23 July. Stressing the importance of the availability of resources for the implementation of the 2004 AP, she referred delegations to Paragraph 51 of the draft 2004 AP which stated that 'the full implementation of this Action Plan will be ensured by the provision of adequate resources'. She informed delegations that the Secretary General had warned against the adoption of further Action Plans or decisions for which there was no political will to allocate the resources necessary for their implementation. In that context, she stated that the 2000 AP had not been adequately followed-up due to insufficient resources and noted that the Gender Advisor's responsibilities had increased without the allocation of commensurate resources. Noting that the work of the Gender Issues Unit covered all three OSCE dimensions and that the OSCE lagged behind most other international organizations in terms of gender issues, she stated that the adoption of the draft 2004 AP had to be met with proper resources. She informed delegations that the draft 2004 AP had now been made less ambitious in order to accommodate concerns about resource requirements and noted that the Senior Gender Advisor and the Training Co-ordinator had been invited to the meeting to inform about the AP's financial implications, which were, she said, at absolute 'rock bottom'.

With regard to the additional human resources required for the implementation of the draft 2004 AP, the *Senior Gender Advisor (SGA)* noted the need for a Gender Advisor (P3) to be assigned to the implementation of the Professional Working Environment Policy as was set out in the 2005 Programme Outline. Due to the high turnover of field staff, she noted the need to have staff who were able to deal with employee grievances which were increasing. Noting the right of locally recruited staff to an appeals procedure, she reported that such cases were very time consuming. She furthermore noted that the 2004 AP's implementation would require an additional staff member (P2) who would assist the small missions on gender issues; in the large missions, existing staff would do that work. With regard to the third post that was required, the SGA stated that that post related to the training element of the 2004 AP and the inclusion of a module on gender in the Organization's training portfolio. She reminded delegations that in the latest draft AP, the training programme had been downsized to a training module.

The Training Co-ordinator stated that the General Orientation Programme's gender element could be expanded and that the current approach to gender training was more *ad hoc* than

systematic. Therefore, the Secretariat required a new staff member to serve itself, the field presences and pre-mission programmes in seconding countries. Noting that the centralised location of such a staff member would help maximise the post's cost-effectiveness, he informed delegations of the difficulties of relying on secondments for such a position and stated that a contracted post would allow greater consistency. *One delegation* queried the overall budgetary and human resource implications of the 2004 AP. *The Co-Chair (Norway)* stated that exact figures were not available, but that following the finalization of the draft text, such indicative figures could be provided. She concluded that the Gender Issues Unit required two posts and the Training Section required one. Stressing the importance of the issue, she encouraged delegations to consult with their capitals, and she pointed out that adopting the AP without subsequent allocation of sufficient financial resources would be a disservice to the gender issue in the OSCE. Turning the attention of delegations to document PC.DEL/95/04/Rev.6, she proceeded to examine the draft 2004 AP in detail.

The Co-Chair (Norway) stated that changes had been made to page 4 of that document in order to align it with the Training Strategy and to lessen the draft 2004 AP's resource requirements. In that context, she recommended a series of changes to the text. In Paragraph 11, bullet point I, she stated that 'OSCE staff' should be changed to 'OSCE officials'; the other changes to that Paragraph were, she remarked, self-explanatory. *One delegation* wished to add the following sentence to that bullet point: 'They will also receive information on OSCE policies concerning gender issues, in particular, on complaint procedures'. *The Co-Chair (Norway)* noted the addition and no objections were raised to those changes. She noted that some delegations (not present) had requested minor changes in the Recruitment section of the text. In particular, she reported that some delegations wished to delete the final sentence of Paragraph 21. *One delegation* stated it had been one of the delegations that proposed that alteration but that it now actually wished to retain that sentence. Reserving the right to return to the issue, it wondered which other delegations had requested that change and for what reason. *The Co-Chair (Norway)* did not wish to create a perceived lack of equality between various groups of States and believed that there was no need to refer specifically to countries whose economies were in transition. She believed that the second last sentence in Paragraph 21 was adequate in that regard. The final sentence of Paragraph 21 was put in brackets pending the delegation's return to the issue. In Paragraph 26, the Co-Chair (Norway) deleted Footnote 8 as several delegations were uncomfortable with it. In Paragraph 28, the present wording was believed to put too much responsibility on the Department of Human Resources and 'will ensure' was changed to 'will seek to ensure'. *One delegation* believed that that alteration made the language more vague. *The Co-Chair (Norway)* recommended the change in the interest of compromise and consensus seeking. In Paragraph 42, she noted that the Guidelines mentioned were not ratified and that it was preferable to write 'as recommended in' rather than 'in compliance with'. In the same paragraph, delegations agreed to the inclusion of the phrase 'Ombudsman/Human Rights Commissioner'. In the eighth bullet point of Paragraph 42, one delegation requested that the last sentence be amended to 'that ensure that proper consideration is given to women claimants in refugee status determination procedures and provide guidelines on claims of gender-related persecution'. In Paragraph 43, the *Co-Chair (Norway)* suggested that 'resources' be changed to 'expertise' in order to avoid confusion in the third last line of the Paragraph. In Paragraph 44, Point A, she recommended the deletion of 'upon request' and suggested that the wording in the first bullet point of Point C be changed as follows: 'OSCE structures will assist participating States in developing programmes'. *The Representative of the ODIHR's Gender Unit* proposed two specific changes to the draft text which, she noted, would be provided in written form. *The Co-Chair (Norway)* noted that they would be included in the text in brackets until it was finalized at another meeting. *One*

delegation recommended that the language that had been used in the Action Plan on Improving the Situation of Roma and Sinti in the OSCE Area be transposed in Paragraph 51. *The Co-Chair (Norway)* stressed that the Secretary General had strongly recommended the language used in Paragraph 51. She hoped that Paragraph 51 could stay as it was. *The Representative of the ODIHR's Gender Unit* reported that the ODIHR would be seeking the Secretariat's guidance on its gender mainstreaming policies. She stated that the ODIHR was willing to withdraw its proposals concerning the language changes in the text if those changes would delay its finalization. *The Co-Chair (Norway)* summarized the issues outstanding from that meeting and hoped that a further meeting could be avoided.

2. Any other Business

The Co-Chair (Norway) noted the need to focus attention on the issue of anti-trafficking and stated the need to have something prepared for the Sofia Ministerial. She urged delegations to consider the issue prior to the next meeting. In that context, she informed delegations that the issue of children and anti-trafficking was important and also that the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly had made interesting proposals at the Edinburgh Meeting in July. She stated that the next meeting would be held on 25 October 2004.

The Co-Chair (Norway) congratulated the Co-Chair (RF), Dr. Vera Gracheva, on her appointment as Senior Advisor, Anti-Trafficking Assistance Unit (ATAU). She also expressed her regret that Dr. Gracheva would no longer be a Co-Chair of the IWG on Gender Equality and Anti-Trafficking and thanked her for her invaluable contribution to the activities of the IWG and in particular to the negotiations on the Action Plan to combat trafficking in Human Beings. She wished Dr Gracheva the best of luck and great success in her new position and looked forward to close co-operation between the IWG and the Special Representative, Dr. Konrad, as well as with the ATAU. *The Co-Chair (RF), Dr. Gracheva*, expressed her appreciation to delegations, and thanked everyone for their great support and friendship. She looked forward to attending the IWG in her new capacity.