



A 5th Framework Programme Research Project funded by the European Commission

Gender - sensitive and women friendly public policies:
a comparative analysis of their progress and impact

Deliverable 6:	Report of EQUAPOL European conference "Gender equality in public policy: Making progress in difficult times"
Authors	Contributions by: Sara Clavero, Mari Runardotter and Maria Stratigaki
Project coordinator:	KEKMOKOP, Panteion University, Athens, Greece
Partners:	School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen's University, Belfast, U.K. DULBEA -Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium Luleå University of Technology, Luleå, Sweden LAW UNIVERSITY OF LITHUANIA, VILNIUS, LITHUANIA
Contract no:	HPSE – CT – 2002 – 00136
Date of issue of the report:	December 2004

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Aims of the conference	2
1.2	Conference programme	2
1.3	Conference speakers and participants	3
1.4	Organisation of the conference	3
2	Plenary sessions	5
2.1	Gender research in FP5 and FP6	5
2.2	Key findings of the EQUAPOL project	5
2.3	Reflections on progress in national and EU gender policy	8
2.4	Views on the future of gender equality policy	10
3	Workshop sessions	13
3.1	Gender equality and inequality in education: challenging gendered power structures and gender stereotypes	13
3.2	The changing face of Europe: the Constitution and a new legal framework for equality	15
3.3	The European Gender Institute: hopes, concerns and priorities for its establishment	18
3.4	Gender studies and gender policies: links and synergies	21
3.5	Gender analysis and gender budgeting: progress in gender mainstreaming	24
3.6	Gender equality and diversity: maintaining gender equality's specificities and resources within a broader equality approach	27
4	Policy conclusions	31
	<u>Appendices</u>	
	1. Conference programme	36
	2. Conference participants	39

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Aims of the European conference

The EQUAPOL European conference formed part of Workpackage 7, which includes the main dissemination activities of the EQUAPOL project. Together with a series of national seminars organised by the EQUAPOL partners (see Deliverable 7), the aim of Workpackage 7 was to:

- increase scientific knowledge on gender mainstreaming in the policy areas studied;
- contribute to scientific debate on the improvement of public policies and on policy tools for promoting gender equality;
- raise awareness about the benefits of integrating a gender perspective within public policy;
- assist in policy development by highlighting appropriate methods and tools for integrating gender equality into public policy.

Three main user groups were addressed by the dissemination activities: academics and researchers; policy-makers; and civil society. Both EU and national levels were targeted.

The European conference aimed to draw lessons from the findings of the study of national and European policies on gender equality for future policy and practice on the integration of gender equality in public policy in Europe. The objective was to provide a forum for dialogue between researchers, policy-makers and non-governmental actors, with the results of EQUAPOL being one part of the evidence and experiences under review. The aim was to move beyond an examination of the current state of affairs, to identify ways of reinforcing efforts to promote gender equality in public policy in the context of national and European developments.

1.2 Conference programme

The programme of the conference wove together plenary and workshop sessions, thus combining in-depth exploration of specific issues with wider debates on the lessons and future directions of gender equality policy in general. It also combined presentations and discussions on the findings of the EQUAPOL project with the reflections of researchers from other projects (e.g. the FP5 supported MAGEEQ project) as well as the experiences of policy-makers from the study countries and other European countries (e.g. Norway and Latvia).

Following the official opening and welcome statements, the first plenary session opened with a presentation on the experiences of gender research in FP5 and FP6 and continued with two presentations on the main findings of the EQUAPOL project.

In the second plenary session before lunch, the EQUAPOL findings were reflected on by two leading figures involved in gender equality in Europe, through their

experiences of promoting gender equality policy and practice at national and European levels.

Following lunch, six thematic workshops took place, organised in two consecutive sessions. The themes of the workshops were selected to highlight key findings of the EQUAPOL project and to focus on important issues concerning the direction of gender equality policy in Europe. Each workshop was coordinated by a member of the EQUAPOL research partnership. The themes were introduced by leading national and European actors and the ensuing discussions structured around key questions. The workshops allowed intensive discussion by the participants.

The main findings of the six thematic workshops were presented the following morning in a plenary session by the workshop coordinators. Before lunch, participants discussed further some of the points raised.

The final plenary session of the conference was a round table discussion, opened by short contributions from leading figures from a range of countries and positions at national and European levels (public administrations, civil society, research), who reflected on the future direction of gender equality policy.

The conference was closed by warm words of thanks to the speakers, organisers and participants.

The final programme of the conference is presented in Appendix 1.

1.3 Conference speakers and participants

Matching the targeted audience of the conference, contributors to the plenary sessions and workshops included: officials of the European Commission involved in gender equality and research; national officials with responsibility for gender equality policy; senior researchers involved in national and European studies on gender equality; prominent actors with direct experience of European policy-making institutions (e.g. European Parliament, European Commission); representatives of key civil society organisations and networks at national and European levels (European Women's Lobby, UK Women's National Commission); and consultants working on gender equality issues.

Over 180 people attended the conference (considerably more than had been anticipated). They included a wide range of people involved in policy-making and research on gender equality policy from Greece and 13 other European countries (including four new Member States). Amongst the participants were national and regional officials, senior researchers and university students, representatives of women's NGOs and gender equality networks, staff responsible for equal opportunities in organisations, and consultants working on gender issues for European and national authorities.

The list of participants is presented in Appendix 2.

1.4 Organisation of the conference

The conference was organised by KEKMOKOP, which provided a team of staff to plan and prepare the conference, including the venue hire, invitations, publicity in English and Greek, accommodation arrangements for participants, preparation and dissemination of briefing papers and documentation, and the many other tasks of organising a European conference.

The management team of EQUAPOL planned and organised the plenary sessions, including selecting the themes and choosing and briefing the speakers. The workshops were organised by EQUAPOL partners: four by KEKMOKOP and one each by the Swedish and UK partners.

The conference was held at the Training Centre of the National Bank of Greece, which provided an excellent venue for the conference, with very helpful professional support staff, well-equipped meeting rooms and good food.

Chapter 2

Plenary Sessions

This chapter outlines the plenary presentations and discussions at the EQUAPOL conference. Sections 2.1 to 2.4 outline the presentations and discussions of the plenary sessions on the first morning of the conference. Section 2.4 outlines the main points of the roundtable presentations and discussions during the final session of the conference.

2.1 Opening speeches

The conference was formally opened by Ms **Eugenia Tsoumani**, General Secretary for Equality in Greece, who noted the importance of maintaining the autonomous status of gender equality and of avoiding its absorption into other equality issues. Gender has distinct characteristics, she noted, and gender equality concerns discrimination against either sex. She noted the trend at EC level to absorb gender into employment goals and promised to do her best to ensure that gender equality is part of the national employment plan. Ms Tsoumani referred to Greece's four-year plan on gender equality, which addresses political, economic and social equality and recognises women's rights as an integral part of human rights. She also noted the importance of linking gender equality with national policy priorities of employment and social inclusion, and announced that a National Equality Committee will be formed, to support the participation of civil society.

2.2 Gender research in FP5 and FP6

The opening presentation of the conference was made by Dr **Myria Vassiliadou**, Scientific Officer from the Social and Human Sciences Research Unit of DG Research at the European Commission, who is responsible for the EQUAPOL project. Dr Vassiliadou briefly outlined the history of European funding of social science research and explained how gender is addressed in the 5th and 6th Framework programmes. She noted that much still needs to be done to ensure that gender issues are addressed appropriately, and mentioned some of the initiatives that have been taken, including a study, published in 2003, to identify the relevance and lessons of European research for gender policy. Finally, Dr Vassiliadou outlined the topics to be addressed under Priority 7 of FP6 that address issues of gender, and encouraged proposals for gender-related research under this Priority.

2.3 Main findings of the EQUAPOL project

Professor **Mary Daly**, Professor of Sociology at the School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen's University Belfast (UK), introduced the session on the main findings of EQUAPOL by outlining the objectives, scope and partners of the EQUAPOL project. Then the main findings of the comparative analyses undertaken by the EQUAPOL project were outlined in two presentations: one by **Professor Daly** on the cross-country comparative analysis; the other by Dr **Mary Braithwaite**, Scientific Coordinator of EQUAPOL, on the analysis of the European dimension.

The findings of the comparative analysis between the study countries

Mary Daly noted that the research had a number of objectives. One was to ascertain current practice in relation to the type of approaches to gender equality in operation in each country and to trace how these are developing. A second objective was to assess how the integration of gender affects policy making, in particular whether and how it acts to improve the quality of policy and governance in general.

Professor Daly's presentation focused on the approach and practice of gender policy in the eight study countries, identifying key trends and comparing countries in terms of their current state and progress in implementing a gender policy. She also presented a characterisation of the countries in terms of the particular approach taken to gender mainstreaming and identified some of the factors that appear to explain the differences in countries' patterns of development.

Progress in developing gender mainstreaming has been uneven within and across countries. Three of the eight countries in the study – Belgium, Ireland and Sweden – have introduced or are in the process of introducing gender mainstreaming. Sweden is in the vanguard. In the other countries, gender mainstreaming efforts are highly fragmented, being confined either to a particular domain or to a specific programme within a domain and disconnected from general governmental policy on gender. Lithuania is something of a case apart by virtue of its particular history and also the steepness and depth of the transition that is currently required.

In general, Professor Daly observed that the integration of gender equality in public policy is spreading transversally – across countries and policy domains – but without any deepening or embedding. All countries examined in this study have made a formal commitment to implement a gender mainstreaming approach to gender equality. A number of common developments in all countries point towards a slow convergence in the approach taken to gender equality. These include the setting up of dedicated gender mainstreaming units, the introduction of policy evaluation and monitoring mechanisms, an increase in social dialogue with civil society and an increase in government investment to equip women's representatives with the necessary skills to participate in policy making.

Convergence in relation to the understanding of the policy problematic or the objectives of policy is more difficult to discern. Both the understanding of the gender equality problematic and the objectives of policy show a significant level of fragmentation, not only across countries but also across different government departments (and policy domains) within countries. For instance, although countries tend to use a similar line of rhetoric regarding the need to attend to the structural and cultural roots of gender inequalities, in many of them there is a significant gap between rhetoric and practice. Generally speaking, gender stereotyping issues, or issues relating to gendered patterns of power relations, are seldom addressed in practice and, when they are, efforts tend to be fragmented and limited to particular policy domains (such as education).

In spite of evidence of convergence in some aspects, there is a significant level of variation in the extent to which the commitment to integrating gender equality into policy is being, or has been, fulfilled and in the methods or strategies that are being

utilised to realise this commitment. Four models or approaches to gender equality in public policy can be identified across the eight countries, testimony to the high degree of variation and to the relative ‘elasticity’ of the concept/approach. Even those countries which have made similar levels of progress tend to follow quite different strategies.

Professor Daly distinguished between gender mainstreaming and “transversalism”, which are used interchangeably in many national documents, but which are different phenomena. Transversalism does not integrate gender into the core of policy, but tends to add it on as an additional objective or consideration. Gender equality appears still to be treated largely as a distinct policy space, rather than being integrated or embedded within mainstream policy domains. The shallowness of gender mainstreaming appears to be due to a lack of a structural approach, and raises a question about the potential limitations of a gender mainstreaming approach to solve the problems it is supposed to overcome.

The European and international dimensions of the progress on gender equality policy

Mary Braithwaite presented the main findings of the analysis of the European dimension of the progress in integrating gender equality in public policy, focusing in particular on the EU influences on national approaches, and briefly outlined some of the international influences.

She observed that EU gender equality policy has given national gender mainstreaming efforts legitimacy and credibility, as indicated by stakeholders in most of the study countries. In some countries, the EU has acted as a decisive force of change. EU equality legislation has been particularly positive, even in the Sweden, and has created new legal mechanisms in the new Member States. However, recent developments at EU level indicate a softening in the use of legislation, and in enforcing and reporting on its implementation, and significant obstacles have been placed in the path of efforts to extend gender equality legislation beyond employment and occupation.

Financial support by the EU has been strong influence in some countries and certain social policy domains (e.g. education through the European Structural Funds). EU support for positive action has also been important, but has recently declined, seemingly as a consequence of the introduction of mainstreaming, in spite of the insistence in EU policy of the “double-track” approach combining mainstreaming with positive action. In some policy domains, such as pensions, the EU influence on gender equality has been very weak, and may even be negative.

Leading actors express disappointment and discontent about the current direction and pace of EU gender equality policy, with doubts being expressed about the effectiveness of mainstreaming as an approach and pessimism about the current ability of the European Commission to lead on gender equality policy.

Dr Braithwaite noted that international influences have been important at certain points in the policy trajectory (especially during preparations for the 1995 Beijing conference) and have played a particularly key role in the development of gender mainstreaming methods and tools, for example gender analysis and gender budgeting. Lithuania’s experience may also indicate that international agencies, such as the

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), as well as some regional bodies (e.g. Nordic), have played a significant role in the new Member States, introducing a different discourse – focusing more on women’s rights and empowerment – from that of the EU.

Dr Braithwaite highlighted some of the similarities and differences between EU and national policies in the study countries. Like Sweden, the EU has overarching objectives on gender equality, to which all policies and programmes should contribute. However, EU objectives on gender equality in specific domains such as education and social protection do not match the overarching objectives, and are more similar to the approaches of countries such as the UK, which connect it with other objectives, notably employment and productivity. She argued that the timing of their formulation may explain the anomaly, the overarching objectives being developed when the Nordic influence was strong, the specific objectives being developed later, when the Lisbon goals (of growth, competitiveness and employment) had become the dominant focus of EU policy.

Equality legislation is a common EU and national tool, but some countries (Ireland, Spain) have gone beyond the employment and occupation limits of current EU legislation and others (Greece, Ireland) have included positive action, which has been contested at EU level. The EU has also made use of equality plans and gender analysis and gender impact assessment, but, as in some countries, the approach is fragmented and there is evidence that the use of these procedures will not be sustained. Consultation structures increased at EU level as part of gender mainstreaming, including higher-level mechanisms of coordination, but there has been no strengthening of civil society consultation and pre-existing mechanisms with national actors (experts, equality bodies) have become less significant. Aspects of the institutional set-up at EU and national levels are similar, showing some of the same strengths and weaknesses.

Overall, the EU has gone beyond a formal commitment to introduce some elements of a gender mainstreaming approach, but it is being implemented with significant delays and there is clear evidence of both a narrowing of gender equality objectives and a decline in human and financial resources allocated to support gender equality policy. The assessment raises a question about the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming at EU level. Is it merely serving the interests of EU social policy and the Lisbon goals, or can it (also) achieve substantive progress on gender equality?

2.4 Reflections on progress in EU and national gender equality policy

Two plenary presentations by national policy-makers completed the first morning session of the EQUAPOL conference.

Gertrud Åström, a leading Swedish gender equality expert and senior advisor to the Swedish government, outlined her views on “How should gender mainstreaming practice be taken forward?” Ms Åström noted the importance of taking a historical perspective, and not expecting rapid change, since we have no previous experience of gender equal societies and structural / societal changes take time. The absence of pre-existing models of gender equality means that new thinking is needed, as well as a

vision of the society we want to achieve. Given this, the political will to push forward is essential.

Much to the astonishment of participants from countries with very different cultures, Ms Åström observed that Sweden is led by politicians who are keen to be considered feminists. She noted that, in the last three to four years, there has been competition amongst political parties as to who is the most feminist, and all party leaders claim to be feminists. This is a strong sign of what society wants. However, this has not come about by chance. There was a feeling by top politicians and officials that they lacked knowledge about gender equality. As a result, Ms Åström was asked to provide training to the Prime Minister and State Secretaries. Training has also extended to regional and local levels and to NGOs. There is now an Action Plan (2004-2010) on gender mainstreaming in the Government administration, which was decided by a group of State Secretaries and focuses on the processes within Government to support gender mainstreaming. There is a strong emphasis on building sufficient knowledge and capacity; so far 150 senior officials in various Ministries have been trained.

The Action Plan is followed-up every two years, and includes reviews by a Government committee (which is led by Ms Åström) and Parliament of all Government policies on gender equality. The policy review includes the goals, the organisational and institutional arrangements and the effectiveness of policy, and pays attention to the different levels (national, regional and local). The review may lead to a new authority working within the state, as well as new goals and legislation.

On some of the important issues that gender equality policy must tackle, Ms Åström highlighted globalisation, sustainable development and human rights. Gender equality is part of a welfare society, which is the ultimate goal, and this needs to be stressed much more strongly. In spite of the considerable progress made in Sweden, the greatest obstacle is the absence of a clear vision of a gender equal society. This means reaching greater clarity on what is not OK now, and what needs to be changed, especially in qualitative aspects.

The morning session was closed by a presentation from **Anna Karamanou**, ex-President of EP Committee on Women's Rights and Equality and a strong campaigner at European level on women's participation in decision-making. The theme of her presentation was "National and EU gender equality policy: opportunities for progress". Ms Karamanou argued for the importance of reinforcing scientific and academic work on gender equality, covering both sexes. The struggle to include gender studies in university curricula has been important, shifting the study of society and humans away from its – biased - focus on men (with women absent, or present only as spouses).

Another important theme of Ms Karamanou's presentation was the link between gender and peace (or conflict), within and between countries, and in personal relationships. Speaking on the same day as the International Day against Violence, she asked if men are happy with their situation, and with the universal standard of the "tough man". The scale of violence against women from male spouses and companions (more serious and deadly than the forms of violence that gain most media and political attention) should mean that it is placed at the top of political priorities.

The DAPHNE programme has been important in raising awareness and “breaking the silence” surrounding gender violence, but the issue is still far from being treated seriously by the (overwhelmingly male) political establishment.

Some progress has been made, noted Ms Karamanou, in progressing gender equality at EU level, but there have also been weaknesses, most notably the failure to enact equality legislation outside the sphere of employment. In response to questions from participants, Ms Karamanou observed that hundreds of years of male domination cannot be overcome rapidly. More female politicians are needed, and it is therefore important to show confidence in what women can do, and build self-confidence to take action.

2.5 Views on the future of gender equality policy

Maria Stratigaki, Chair of the roundtable session, set the scene for the final presentations and discussions of the conference. She noted that gender equality policy is now operating in a new context in Europe. The expansion of the European Union from 15 to 25 countries brings qualitative changes, since gender equality and inequalities – and gender equality policies – vary significantly across the member states. Moreover, there is the new Constitutional Treaty, the emergence of conservative tendencies in economic and family policies, and new tools and instruments relating to gender equality and gender mainstreaming. New policies are needed, and new synergies across policy areas and institutions.

Ilute Lāce, a Vice-President of the European Women’s Lobby and a gender activist from Latvia, opened the roundtable presentations by noting that there have been achievements in terms of gender equality. She argued that, for organisations working on gender equality in the new Member States, the *acquis communautaire* has been particularly important, while enlargement has created new opportunities for networking and campaigning, especially through the European Women’s Lobby. The promotion of women in decision-making and parity democracy remains an important issue, especially when observing the results of the nominations for Commissioners and of the European Parliament elections. For NGOs in the new Member States, funding from the European Social Fund is vital, and strengthening the resources for gender equality actions also remains an important challenge.

Ausra Gribauskiénė, Senior Specialist in the Department of Science and Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Science, Lithuania, outlined some of the challenges concerning gender equality in education in Lithuania and the steps being taken to promote equal opportunities in education and science. She noted that important obstacles remain, such as lack of human and financial resources for the promotion of gender equality policy in science, and that positive actions are needed to improve gender equality at all levels of in education.

Opening her presentation, **Mieke Verloo** Lecturer in Political Science and Women’s Studies at Radboud University (Netherlands) and Research Director of the FP5 MAGEEQ project, posed a question: “what should be done with EU gender equality policy?” Positive and negative trends are in evidence. On the one hand, there have been important developments in gender equality policy and there appears to be a broad political acceptance of certain fundamental rights, seen, for example, in the

European Parliament's rejection of the proposed Italian Commissioner, Buttiglione, in spite of a conservative shift in the political balance within the European Parliament. On the other hand, there is increasing political polarisation and turbulence across the European Union, partly as a result of enlargement, which has some risks for gender equality.

Priorities are needed to progress gender equality policy, focusing on strategic areas where progress can be made. Data and research are essential for any kind of good policy-making. Better information and perhaps new kinds of data are needed. FP7 should be used as an opportunity, but lobbying will be needed for better knowledge-banks and data-bases relevant to gender equality. The European Gender Institute could play a key role, as well as the research community and feminist organisations.

Concerning gender mainstreaming, Ms Verloo expressed concerns about the proliferation of technocratic tools, but little evidence of participatory approaches, which can build knowledge, understanding and commitment. There is a need for independent monitoring of policy; the task of gender mainstreaming cannot be left to policy-makers alone. This raises the connection between gender equality policies and the feminist community, and between European and international models of working on gender equality. Using the Open Method of Coordination could be a way of conducting a wider dialogue on gender equality policy, and broader involvement of different actors in policy-making.

The issue of intersectionality and multiple identities is extremely important, and this poses significant challenges for feminists, Ms Verloo argued. Many women do not identify with feminism, and some (e.g. young Muslim women in the Netherlands) regard feminism as racist. Gender equality can be used to pursue conservative policies, such as family policy in Austria. How to address multiple identities conceptually and institutionally (e.g. by a single mechanism), and how to ensure that gender equality supports other rights and equalities, are major questions to be tackled.

Yvonne Strachan, Head of the Scottish Executive's Equality Unit in the UK, continued the exploration of important issues for the future. She noted that the complexion of the EU has changed with enlargement: cultural diversity has increased and there are different policy-making traditions and different priorities. This offers the opportunity to do things in a different way. It seems important, she argued, to restate the vision of what we want to achieve, and to do so in ways that allow a range of new voices to be heard. Given the political priority of economic growth, there is a need to elaborate a vision of growth where there is also gender equality, and to find the links and common objectives. Ms Strachan mentioned a recent assessment of the contribution of gender equality policy to economic growth, which made the argument for equal participation on equal terms in order to achieve growth. For each policy, there is a need to find the common points.

Concerning policy-making, Ms Strachan noted the different policy-making frameworks and traditions, and the need to rethink policy-making on gender equality. Like Ms Verloo, she argued for the importance of selecting strategic entry points for gender equality. Gender mainstreaming carries a risk of being spread too thinly, and having insufficient responsibility and ability to carry commitments forward across a wide range of areas. The Scottish and Northern Ireland experiences may be helpful,

she suggested, particularly the open two-way process of dialogue in Scottish policy-making since devolution (which is different from one-way consultation). Stakeholder dialogue outside Parliament and administration is essential, as well as outside representatives being involved in Parliamentary committees. Reiterating a point made by Ms Verloo, Ms Strachan noted that policy-making cannot be left to policy-makers, as they do not have all the information. Greater transparency, stakeholder engagement and instruments for scrutinising policy are all needed. The European Gender Institute could play an important role in exchanging information on approaches, enabling shared learning and supporting networking amongst a wider range of stakeholders.

The final panellist, **Agnès Hubert**, Member of the Group of Political Advisors of the President of the European Commission, addressed two of the challenges for gender equality policy in the future: a broader involvement of stakeholders; and engaging with a broader approach to equality.

Ms Hubert argued that making progress with gender equality policy requires a broader involvement of stakeholders. She noted, for example, the importance of engaging more women in the European institutions, by creating personal and intellectual interest in gender equality. This requires simpler language (“gender”, “gender mainstreaming”, “empowerment” are all esoteric, and often very difficult to translate), and the creation of a more open debate about gender equality. There is also a need to engage in mainstream policy, such as macro-economic policy, and to question some of the fundamentals, such as the value of growth indicators such as GDP.

Concerning gender equality in the context of a broader equality approach, Ms Hubert noted that this was already on the agenda at EU level. This can be seen in the Green Paper on Anti-Discrimination, published earlier in 2004, which did not take into account gender equality policy until a last-minute intervention by the Commissioner for DG EMPL (and even then only small additions were inserted). Although the new Commissioner for DG EMP has “equal opportunities” in his title, the person in the Cabinet responsible for gender equality is a specialist in disability. There is clear evidence of increased support for a generic equality approach, and a downgrading of gender equality. It is necessary to defend the specificity of gender, and of women and women’s empowerment, and to defend gender-specific institutions and mechanisms, not just within the Commission but also to other rights-based movements. This is why the European Gender Institute is so important.

The final discussion by participants highlighted a number of important points, including the importance of women’s efforts to create and sustain their own rights and freedoms, and the need for women’s rights campaigners to protect the rights of other groups who face discrimination. Gender equality must not be hijacked by those wishing to assert conservative religious values, intolerance towards homosexuality or the traditional roles of women. On the other hand, feminism can be supported irrespective of political affiliation and there is an urgent need to build political alliances around gender equality. The issue of whether many women want gender equality was raised by one questioner, but, as Ilute Lāce noted, “free choice” is mediated by social and cultural values and not all women are “free” to make choices or to assert their independence. Participants were reminded of the opportunities to take gender equality forward, including in European research (by making inputs into the shape of FP7) and through promoting the European Gender Institute.

Chapter Three

Thematic workshops

This chapter presents the discussions and main findings of the six thematic workshops.

3.1 Gender equality and inequality in education: challenging gendered power structures and gender stereotypes

3.1.1 The topic and speakers

Examples from Sweden of gender equality policy and gender inequality in education were the focus of discussion at this workshop, which was opened with presentations by **Christina Mörtberg**, scientific responsible of EQUAPOL from the Division of Gender and Technology at the Department of Human Work Sciences, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden, and **Gertrud Åström**, a leading Swedish gender expert.

3.1.1 The presentations

Christina Mörtberg presented some examples of gender equality or gender mainstreaming projects in the education system in Sweden. First of all, Ms Mörtberg stressed that gender equality has been an issue in Sweden since the 1970s and is today a policy area in its own right. This means that gender-sensitive and women-friendly public policies have been on the agenda for more than 30 years. Today the focus is placed on gender mainstreaming, a strategy that aims at raising awareness and knowledge, and places the responsibility for gender equality at various levels. Thus, Sweden is a woman-friendly state. However, it is equally important to remember that this is not always a guarantee for gender equality. In spite of the progress made so far, a gender and power structure still characterizes Swedish society. Therefore the government has declared that from now on measures must be based on feminist perspectives. By this is meant that there has to be awareness of the gender and power structure that implies that women are subordinate and men superior, and the intention must be to break this existing order. It also means that the government regards gender as socially constructed, that gendered patterns are created on the basis of upbringing, culture, economic framework, structures of power and political ideology.

The challenges for future gender equality policy, according to Ms Mörtberg, are to change women's and men's qualitative rights and possibilities. Since there is still much to be done to reach the goal of gender equality, the government finds it necessary to integrate gender equality within all political areas.

The Swedish public school system and the objectives of gender equality were then briefly described, followed by three examples from each level of education, preschool, compulsory school and upper secondary school project conducted in a municipality in the north of Sweden.

Gertrud Åström contributed a historical retrospective on the education sector. She pointed out the changes and the improvement of equality that has taken place in the last (20th) century due to girls and women's access to education. It is 100 years ago since the first married woman defended her doctoral thesis (Gerda Nillson defended her thesis in 1903). The increase of higher education has also brought about an increase in the proportion of women; today more women enrol in university studies than men. Despite this, there are still areas such as science and technology that are dominated by men.

Ms Åström also emphasised how the establishment of Women's Studies and Gender as a research area started in the end of 1970s through government support. This is also an example of the progress of gender equality in the education sector. Today, almost all universities offer courses in gender issues. Another effort to increase gender equality in education, on a compulsory level, is the training of teachers in gender issues, to become so-called "gender pedagogues". Ms Åström emphasised that this is an example of the progress of gender equality that has taken place in a limited time in the education. But this also shows that it is possible to change conditions even if it takes time.

3.1.2 Main points of the discussions

The discussions in the workshop were vivid, probably because all the participants had experience as pupils/students. Questions addressed by many of the participants were about globalisation and social transformations, and how their consequences intervene in gender equality policies.

Questions that were addressed were: Do refugees have access to education; and do girls have access to the same extent as boys? Since all of the contributors were from Sweden, gender equality policies in Sweden were in focus. In the discussions it was pointed out that Sweden is a rather homogeneous society compared to more heterogeneous countries in Europe. Does this have relevance for the success of gender equality in Sweden? In a more heterogeneous society there may be other asymmetrical power relations, which increase the complexity and complicate the realisation of gender equality. In a changing and more diverse society other relations than gender have to be highlighted, as there are significant risks for marginalisation on the basis of ethnicity, for example. Other questions that were addressed in the workshop were the male dominance of science and technology. How to integrate women in areas such as science and technology? How to create sustainable changes also in science and technology?

Concerning minority groups, it was pointed out that all do not have access to education, and there are huge variations across countries. This is a growing issue because of the globalisation and the increasing multi-cultural society. The question is also important in the European Union with the entry of new member states. It also shows that the historical context should never be forgotten. However, the EU can be used to a higher degree in order to prevent discrimination – and especially discrimination against women.

There were some comments on boys' underachievement, which has caused a moral panic in some countries. Participants questioned if it is the gender and power structure showing up again, or whether this is really a significant problem of gender inequality.

The issue of how young people make their choice of education was raised. Many factors influence how young people make their choices, but training of teachers in gender issues could be one way of changing gender stereotyped patterns. However, it should be noted that the education sector cannot solve the problem alone e.g. the labour market must also act! In other words, we must work in all fields and contexts in society.

Important questions about science and research are: whose knowledge is being constructed, whose (version of) science is being pursued, and who has the right to speak? That is, epistemological aspects are crucial because it is where we build knowledge and gender issues are embedded in this. Normative aspects are gendered and needs to be addressed. In order to be able to change, normative questions needs to be considered even if we know that changing them requires a long time. But small winds of change are also important in aiming for a gender equal society.

3.2 Changing face of Europe: The Constitution and new legal framework for gender equality

3.2.1 The topic of the workshop

The workshop on the Constitutional Treaty took place only one month after the endorsement of the Treaty in Rome on October 29, 2004. It provided the opportunity for the participants of the conference to get an overview of the final provisions on gender equality, as well as a profound analysis of the potential use of the provisions for advancing gender equality in Europe. This information was very useful for some of the participants, especially those representing women's groups, to decide on their overall position on the Treaty.

Maria Stratigaki, scientific responsible of EQUAPOL, opened the workshop by pointing out the crucial role of the Treaty's provisions for future EU policies. She reminded participants of the important role of the two major Treaties, Rome and Amsterdam, for gender equality. The Treaty of Rome allowed the initiation of EU policies for equal opportunities between women and men on the basis of only one Article (119 on equal pay). Since then, policies have extended far beyond the scope of this article, including issues outside the labour market, such as the promotion of women in decision-making. Changes in the Treaty of Amsterdam (new articles and revision of Article 119) were very progressive for gender equality, legitimating positive action and gender mainstreaming. The European Women's Lobby's mobilisation has been very influential in these changes. Further positive factors were an increased number of women in decision-making positions at EU level, as well as the need of the EU to enlarge its scope and legitimise its political power through closer attention to civil society's concerns. Unfortunately, the current economic, political and social conditions that shaped the Constitutional Treaty were far less favourable for gender equality than those of the Amsterdam Treaty. The discussion at

the workshop aimed to identify the potential gains and losses of the Constitutional Treaty, as assessed through a critical reading of the text.

3.2.2 The workshop speakers

Ms. **Sofia Spiliotopoulou**, Attorney-at-Law, Vice-President of the European Women's Lawyers Association (EWLA) and vice-President of the "Association des Femmes de l'Europe Méridionale (AFEM)" has worked as an expert for the European Commission since 1986 (member of the European Network on Equality Law). She was active in monitoring the implementation of EU Directives in Greece and in preparing Cyprus to harmonise its equality law with the *acquis communautaire*, before its accession. During the last two years she has been active in analysing and proposing textual changes on the European Convention's draft Treaties under her capacity as representative of women's NGOs. **Emanuela Lombardo**, is senior researcher of the EU funded research project MAGEEQ on gender mainstreaming, in the Department of Politics at the University Complutense de Madrid. She has worked on the European Constitution and has analysed if and how there has been gender mainstreaming in its content and its process.

3.2.3 The presentations

Sofia Spiliotopoulou presented the gender equality relevant Articles of the Treaty, pointing out their potential use by pro-women legislators and policy makers. The most important issues regarding gender equality provisions in the Treaty are:

1. In Article I-2 (the Union's values), "equality between women and men" is mentioned together with other values such as pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice and solidarity. Although this reference is not included in the first phrase of the Article (together with another group of values such as human dignity, freedom, democracy), it is still considered to be a fundamental feature of the European identity. Gender equality is a fundamental human right whose respect and promotion, in law and practice, is required of Member States and any European State wishing to be a candidate for accession. This achievement was the result of negotiations steered by the Irish Presidency (first semester of 2004) following a long-standing demand of a large number of European NGOs and gender bodies. The most influential of them was the European Parliament "Commission for Women's Rights and Equality" under the Presidency of Anna Karamanou.
2. In Article I-3, equality between women and men is stated among the Union's objectives.
3. The Charter of Fundamental Rights was incorporated in the Treaty, at the request of civil society organisations. However, the Charter is incorporated in a way that it is weakened compared to other Treaty's provisions. Its interpretation should be done by the courts "with due regard to the explanations prepared under the authority of the Praesidium of the Convention". This limits the strength of the Charter to *acquis* in fundamental rights whose continuity is ensured according to the Preamble of the Treaty.
4. Positive action is maintained in Article II-83 but without its objective "with a view to ensuring full equality in practice between women and men" as it states in Article 141 of the TEC.

5. An anti-discrimination clause on the basis of sex is still included in the Treaty (Article II-81), as well as gender-mainstreaming clause (Article III-116). The latest is extended, in a way, to domestic violence, which the Union shall aim to combat according to the Declaration initiated by the Spanish government. The Declaration states also that Member States should take measures to prevent and punish these criminal acts and to support and protect the victims.
6. There is a dangerous shift of focus from “reconciliation of work and family” (aimed at improving women’s jobs opportunities) to “reconciliation of family and work” (aimed at protecting the family) in Article II-93. This may allow diminishing protection at work. This possible interpretation and dangerous perspective is also supported by the fact that the objective of “quality” in jobs, as promoted in the Lisbon process, is not included in the Constitutional Treaty.
7. Overall missing provisions in terms of gender equality are: references to male violence (with the exception of the declaration on domestic violence) and to gender balance in decision-making processes in the EU Institutions (European Commission, European Parliament, electoral lists etc). Both were heavily argued and lobbied by all types of women’s actors in the European Institutions and the civil society.

Sofia Spiliotopoulou concluded by an overall appreciation of the Treaty in terms of gender equality. She argued in favour of the Treaty, not because it is a Treaty that promotes gender equality but because there is no chance to have a better Treaty in the present conditions. She stated that one could be in favour only because the current economic, political and social conditions would not allow improvements in the case of re-opening of negotiations. Optimal utilisation and exploitation of all existing provisions by feminists and civil society seem to be the best possible strategy.

Emanuela Lombardo presented a comprehensive analysis of the process of mainstreaming gender in the Conventions that drafted the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the European Constitution. She structured her presentation around five basic requirements that feminist literature has identified as indicators of a proper application of gender mainstreaming: (a) Shift in concepts: a broader concept of gender equality is employed, (b) Incorporation of a gender perspective into the mainstream political agenda, (c) Inclusion and participation of women in decision-making bodies and processes, (d) Prioritising gender equality objectives and framing specific policies of special relevance for women and (e) Shift in institutional and organisational cultures (policy process, policy mechanisms and policy actors).

Concerning the European Convention the analysis in each of the five indicators showed that that it maintained strong patriarchal elements typical of most political contexts. More specifically, the European Constitution failed to mark significant progress in each of the above five criteria.

- (a) The concept of gender equality has not broadened to cover other policies than employment, the legal basis of gender policies has not been strengthened and nor has the strategy of gender mainstreaming. Also, the difficulty to include “equality between women and men” instead of “equality” among the Union’s values, as well as the emphasis on anti-discrimination policies, indicates a tacit shift from gender equality to equality between all social groups who are discriminated on different bases (age, race, ethnicity etc).

- (b) Incorporating a gender perspective into the mainstream political agenda was not very successful either. Policy areas such as health, culture, education, budgeting, security and defence policies have not been informed by a gender perspective. Only trafficking and sharing of family and work responsibilities have integrated a concern with gender. In general, gender mainstreaming did not achieve any reorientation of the mainstream of the constitution making process. Apart from the introduction of formal concepts of gender mainstreaming in the text, it failed to effectively apply gender mainstreaming to its own policy making experience.
- (c) Women's participation in the European Convention was only 17 (14%). Only 2 of the 12 members of the Presidium were women, and only one chaired one of the eleven working groups. These figures were far below the requested 40% of women in all decision-making bodies. Even more dangerous was the response of the President d'Estaing arguing that women compensated for their low quantitative presence by the strong personalities of some of them!
- (d) Prioritisation of gender and social objectives was far from achieved in the European Constitution. The difficulty of setting up a working group on Social Europe and the attitude of the Presidium towards social issues are indicative of the fact that social issues and actors concerned with them were *de facto* marginalised in the discourse of the Convention.
- (e) There was no evidence that there was a reorganisation of the policy process so that institutional actors take a gender perspective into account. In contrast, almost all proposals by women's NGPs and the European Parliament to change policy processes were systematically ignored. The same attitude was shown for proposals to set up appropriate mechanisms for gender mainstreaming made by Women's Rights Committee of the EP. Policy actors, especially from the civil society, were marginalised from the EU institutional process.

3.2.4 Discussion points

As expected the discussion in the workshop was very vivid and interesting. The main question raised was whether feminists should support the European Constitution or not. There were different, and strong opinions in the audience both in favour and against. The first argued that we must not expect anything better in the current situation, the second that the Constitution is a sexist product that could, by no means, result in any advance in gender equality. Between these two positions, some of the participants argued that we have to obtain the best possible advantage from the provisions, as well as to denounce publicly through civil society mobilisation any possible backlash that may occur by the interpretation of the Constitution in a hostile political environment.

3.3 The European Gender Institute: hopes, concerns and priorities for its establishment

The workshop on the proposed establishment of a European Gender Institute was opened by the Chair, Mary Braithwaite (Scientific Coordinator of EQUAPOL), who introduced the two speakers: **Agnès Hubert**, Member of the Group of Political Advisors of the President of the European Commission (previously advisor to the Women's Rights Committee of the European Parliament and with a long involvement

in European gender equality policy, including as Head of the Equal Opportunities Unit in the European Commission in the early 1990s); and **Lut Mergaert** from Yellow Window Management Consultants (Belgium), who prepared the 2003 feasibility study for European Parliament on the European Gender Institute.

3.3.1 Opening presentations

Agnès Hubert started by outlining the background to the European Gender Institute (EGI) and explained why the European Parliament had decided, in 2003, to take forward the earlier commitment made by the EU to establish an EGI. She noted the debates stimulated by the EC on European policy and governance, and the marginalisation of gender equality, in spite of its relevance to the new forms of governance. Although progress on gender equality has been achieved, worrying signs are also evident, and the presence of women in political structures is still insufficient to change policy priorities and the political culture. Structural barriers exist, but there is also a need to create more stakeholders for gender equality, amongst women and men, and to convince more people that the “norms” need to be changed, with benefits for all. It is also difficult to overcome the trap of universalism, which is held dear by many democrats, and which blocks recognition of distinctions and differences. Moreover, addressing the “minestrone soup” of multiple discriminations demands common strategies to defend the rights of women, children, the disabled, etc, while dealing with gender as a distinct issue. There should not be a competitive approach to issues of discrimination.

One of the functions of the EGI would be to animate the debate on these issues. A catalyst is needed, and a means of bringing together different traditions, for example between East and West. Ms Hubert described the role of the EGI as a spider in a web, at the heart of a network, occupied with making and remaking the connections. The EGI should be a centre of knowledge, and a support centre for gender mainstreaming. It should create links with national and regional equality institutes, should coordinate research and increase the visibility of gender in Community policies.

One of the key tasks is to increase the ownership by actors of the EGI, including people in the Member States involved in gender projects, such as DAPHNE, research, ESF, etc. The EGI will need proper resources, human and financial, and a good location. All opportunities to ensure that the EGI is properly established should be pursued, including the Beijing + 10 review under the Luxembourg Presidency. There is a need to learn from the effective lobbying of the insurance industry against the proposed Directive on sex equality in access to goods and services, and to mount an equally effective campaign in support of a properly resourced and located European Gender Institute.

Lut Mergaert outlined the history of the proposed establishment of the EGI, starting with the 1999 Swedish Presidency meeting in Stockholm and its adoption at the 2000 Nice Council and inclusion in the European Social Agenda. In 2001 a feasibility study was commissioned by the European Commission, but no progress was made until 2004, in spite of two opinions in its favour by the EC advisory committee on equal opportunities. In June 2004, under the Irish Presidency, the Council approved the creation of the EGI, as a consequence of the 2003 feasibility study by the European Parliament.

Ms Mergaert explained that the EGI is likely to be an autonomous Community body (similar in status to CEDEFOP and the EUMC). The proposed mission of the EGI is: to promote and help realise gender equality; act as a knowledge centre serving the goals of EU gender equality policy; and supporting the EC, not taking over from it. Its roles should be: to collect and interpret data to provide objective, timely, reliable and comparable information; to provide technical assistance to policy-makers; to disseminate information and raise awareness; and to develop and foster networking. The structure should be “light and flexible”, yet able to make an impact. A four pillar structure has been proposed, involving: a director and staff; a light management board; a larger advisory forum; and a network of national focal points. The feasibility study for the European Parliament suggests 50 to 60 staff and experts, with a budget from 15 M€ in its first year to 26 M€ per year when operational.

The situation at the time of the workshop is that the European Commission “plans to adopt (a) proposal before the end of 2004, and intends to allocate 52,7 millions Euros to it over the 2007-2013 period”, which, as Ms Mergaert noted, is considerably less than the budget suggested by the feasibility study and relatively low in comparison with other Community agencies. Moreover, the current proposal is that the EGI is “budget neutral”, meaning no additional resources to support its establishment and functioning.

3.3.2 Discussion

Many of the initial comments and questions of the workshop participants concerned doubts about the political will to promote gender equality and to properly establish a gender institute. Responses to these doubts by some participants and speakers argued for the importance of supporting – and lobbying for – its establishment. Good arguments must be found, said one participant, for its establishment. Janet Veitch, Director of the Women’s National Commission in the UK, noted that her organisation is very supportive, but that UK actors need to be convinced that it will add value. The best arguments in the UK are to demonstrate the links with women’s productivity and employment, with gender mainstreaming presented as a technical process. Mieke Verloo, a senior researcher on gender issues, suggested that the EGI had to appear a “safe” option, in opposition to more radical positions.

The European Commission’s proposal that it should be “budget neutral” was expressed as a concern by a number of participants, as this means both a much smaller budget than that suggested by the feasibility study and the re-allocation of existing resources, suggesting that some current initiatives may be discontinued. As Ms Mergaert pointed out, if the budget is less than that indicated by the feasibility study, the role of the EGI should be more limited. Ms Hubert mentioned that efforts can and must be made to tap other resources, for example from Commission services requiring support with the mainstreaming of gender in the policy domains and programmes for which they are responsible. Ilute Lāce, Vice-President of the European Women’s Lobby, noted how essential it will be to ensure sufficient resources. The Chair observed that the current Framework Strategy and Programme was anyway nearing its end, and that the major review of budget lines and programmes by DG EMPL meant a new approach to Community programmes and funding. There was a general feeling

that a major effort will be required within the European Commission and the Member States to ensure that the EGI is established with sufficient resources.

The location of the EGI was raised by a series of participants. As Ms Mergaert pointed out, it will almost certainly be located in a new Member State and some of the enlargement countries have already expressed interest. A sufficiently central location, able to attract appropriately qualified personnel, will be important to achieve.

Recognising the risks of establishing an EGI with insufficient resources and a too-limited role, much of the ensuing discussion focused on how to promote and lobby for the EGI. Alain Denis, a consultant from Belgium, argued that arguments in support of the EGI must be differentiated for different audiences (for different member states, for government and civil society). Mieke Verloof suggested preparing a lobby dossier, targeted at different stakeholders. Agnès Lambert pointed out that the Beijing + 10 review is an opportunity, as well as subsequent Presidencies.

In her final closing remarks, Agnès Hubert raised a new and interesting issue, of how the EGI could engage with the changing character of EU policy making, in particular the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). She noted that gender equality has not yet used the OMC method, and there may be opportunities for using the OMC process to support harmonisation and benchmarking and to take forward gender equality policy.

3.4 Gender studies and gender policy: links and synergies

3.4.1 Theme and aims of the workshop

The workshop on “Gender studies and gender policy: links and synergies” was opened by **Maria Stratigaki**, scientific responsible of EQUAPOL, who introduced the speakers and outlined the main themes. She highlighted the importance of building links and synergies between gender studies and gender equality policies. Nowadays, gender equality is fully recognised as a value of our democratic societies. Although this may often only be rhetorical, such a link seems to be necessary and mutually reinforcing. In most EU countries, gender equality policies in education support gender studies by granting funds and publicity. Gender studies also support gender equality policies by providing knowledge, tools and methods for better confronting real and urgent inequality problems. However, such potentially useful synergies are not always possible. Some policy makers argue that gender experts are often too intellectual and their research findings too sophisticated to be directly applicable in the real world. Some academics and researchers on gender issues argue that policy makers are too conservative and adopt compromised approaches to gender equality, which are not sufficiently feminist.

The workshop aimed to discuss these issues in the context of the presentation of two good examples: (a) the actions undertaken by the European Commission “Women in Science” and (b) the current Greek education policy in which there was a substantial contribution by gender experts during design and implementation.

3.4.2 Presentations

The first speaker **Veronique Degraef**, from the Unit “Women in Science” of the European Commission, DG Research, could not attend due to unexpected personal commitments. Her paper was presented by the coordinator of the workshop with the use of a Power Point presentation. The paper introduced the work of the Unit “Women and Science” by presenting the (a) background, (b) the actions and (c) the future perspectives of the Unit.

Three problems were defined in the first place: Under-representation of women in many areas of scientific research (engineering, technology etc) and in decision-making positions, lack of attention to gender issues in research content and need for more systematic monitoring and benchmarking. On the basis of provisions by the Treaty of Amsterdam and Commission Communication on gender mainstreaming there was a political support to initiate actions on Women in Science in the framework of the emerging European Research Area in 2000.

The main components of actions were: the policy forum, the Gender Watch System and the better understanding of the problem and its role in promoting research in the EU. The Policy Forum was composed by the Helsinki Group of national policy makers, the ENWISE Expert Group on the Central and Eastern Europe, the Exert Group on Women in Industrial Research and the newly established European Platform of Women Scientists. The Gender Watch System includes internal Commission tasks such as the target of 40% of women’s participation in FP6, the integration of the gender dimension where relevant in research projects, the gender action plans in thematic priorities of FP6 and the Gender Monitoring Studies. Finally aiming at better understanding of the problem of Women in Science, a call for research proposals on this issue was published early 2004.

Future perspectives in the new landscape and the new priorities of Research in the EU include the following: mobilization of the Helsinki Group for a dialogue on national policies and the introduction of benchmarking and deeper cooperation among them, the establishment of ERANET for the coordination of women in science programmes at European level, the setting of the European Platform for a more democratic structure linking networks and involving in research policy debate. The new EU policy priorities in this area are based on the elaboration of the new concept of “gender fairness and scientific excellence”. They, therefore, aim at more gender research in Europe, boosting numbers and seniority of women scientists and improving their career and work/life balance.

The interesting aspect of this presentation was the process of development of EU policies promoting women researchers, supporting research on gender and mainstreaming gender in research. By supporting these three aspects of Women in Science, Commission contributed to the production of knowledge on gender issues and, by disseminating this knowledge among policy makers, to improving gender mainstreaming of EU policies. This is an example of good practice in this field as it created strong synergies among EU Institutions and the academia in most EU member states.

The second speaker of the workshop, **Savvatoú Tsolakidou**, Head of Unit “Projects for linking education with the labour market”, Operational Programme for Education and Initial Vocational Training (EPEAEK) at the Ministry of Education presented the Greek situation on women’s participation in education in relation with their participation in the labour market. Women’s high participation in all educational levels is contradicted by their low participation in the labour market and to existing high occupational segregation by sex. The explanation can be found in the ways that the education system works and, especially, through gender stereotyping in disciplines and professional orientation.

To change this situation, the Ministry of Education, in the framework of its Operational Programme EPEAEK, has initiated a large number of actions aiming to improve girls’ access to the labour market. The actions targeted both higher and middle education levels. In the higher education post-graduate studies (Masters) in Gender Studies were funded, as well as the improvement of graduate studies in terms of new curricula and visibility activities. In addition, research grants to Universities have ring-fenced funds for topics related to gender equality and women. In the middle education level, there was a production of new textbooks on gender equality and other useful educational tools for teachers of all disciplines. Programmes aimed at raising the awareness of teachers about gender equality were implemented and among them, specific programmes promoting gender balanced professional orientation to young boys and girls. Innovative positive action in favour of girls studying in technological and other “male dominated” fields were launched by allocating scholarships and facilitating traineeships for young girls throughout the country. In all these programmes (which were new for Greece), the Ministry has collaborated with researchers and academics with prior experience and expertise in gender issues.

A particularly interesting aspect of this presentation was the process of designing and implementing new and innovative policies for gender equality by the Ministry of Education for the first time in its history. This was possible only through the efficient, although obligatory, cooperation with academic experts on gender equality, after the political decision to integrate gender equality perspective and the necessary ring-fenced funds in the educational policy.

3.4.3 Main points of the discussions

The discussion in the workshop was very lively between participants who were mostly involved in the education system. Questions about better targeting of gender equality policies in education were discussed when a Greek participant raised the issue of targeting the primary level of education and not only at the secondary and tertiary levels of education. In this context gender mainstreaming of school textbooks at the early stage could be crucial. At this point Savvatoú Tsolakidou further explained how EPEAEK implemented gender proofing on textbooks for second level, whereas primary level textbooks were subject to gender proofing by the Pedagogical Institute of the Ministry of Education.

An Italian participant initiated the discussion about the problem of lack of professional perspectives of women who focused their studies on gender issues and carried out gender research. It was argued that the lack of synergies and, even worse, the currently backlash in gender equality policies makes labour market integration for

gender equality professionals very problematic. Mutually influenced studies and policies in times of regression in social public spending can attack gender studies and undermine their necessity. A further danger for gender studies is the increasing trend to include sex among all other grounds of discrimination as Article 13 of the Treaty of Amsterdam initiated it. In this context, gender studies tend to be included among anti-discrimination studies on race, ethnicity and disability and thus, tend to lose visibility, dynamism and distinctive funding.

The workshop discussion concluded by pointing out the advantages of close cooperation and mutual understanding for both gender studies and gender policies. Such a co-operation should be enhanced and actively supported by both sides. Policy-making institutions, like the European Commission and national Ministries, should establish group of gender experts for on-going monitoring of their policies and set up transformative evaluation processes. Universities and Research Institutes should also strengthen links with policy makers by involving them in their activities and informing about research results, as well as by undertaking research on policy issues, methodology and policy tools in all areas of public policies.

3.5 Gender analysis and gender budgeting: progress in gender mainstreaming

Three speakers introduced the themes of the 5th workshop, which focused on the use of gender mainstreaming tools and progress in mainstreaming gender in policy: **Anne Havnør**, Senior Advisor on Gender Equality at the Department for Family Affairs, Child Care and Gender Equality, Ministry of Children and Family Affairs, Norway; **Mieke Verloo**, Lecturer in Political Science and Women's Studies at Radboud University (NL) and Research Director of the FP5 MAGEEQ project on gender mainstreaming; and **Elizabeth Villagómez**, Senior Partner of Almenara Economic and Social Studies, Madrid (ESP), who recently worked on gender budgeting for the UN.

3.5.1 Presentations

Anne Havnør opened by the session by explaining Norway's experience of gender mainstreaming. Gender mainstreaming in Norway dates from the mid 1980s and is not an isolated strategy, but is based on legislation, backed by specific measures and supported by political commitment. Nonetheless, gender equality is subject to "benevolent agreement" and is not a major political priority. Gender equality "yields" to other priorities when there is a conflict of interest.

The Gender Equality Act (1978, 2002) has a global scope, covering all spheres of society including family life, which is a strength, but perhaps also a weakness (too open-ended). The Act requires public authorities to promote gender equality, through active, targeted and systematic efforts in all sectors of society. This includes such measures as a statutory duty to ensure a minimum 40% of either sex on publicly appointed boards and committees and a requirement for ex-ante evaluation of, among others, the gender impact in the central guidelines for policy preparation and legislative reform. Employers in the public and private sectors have a similar obligation, in the context of personnel policy.

Norway's Gender Budgeting (GB) initiative was initiated in 2000 by the Gender Equality Unit in the Ministry of Children and Family Affairs, inspired by the horizontal approach to environmental issues in the budget process. The GB initiative has revived an active and coordinated approach to gender mainstreaming and has resulted in an annex on gender equality in the state budget proposals for 2003, 2004 and 2005. The GB process entails dialogue with the Ministry of Finance coordinating the budget, intra-ministerial cooperation with the Department of Planning and Administration which coordinates the Ministries' budget proposals and intra-ministerial involvement of the line/sector departments. Other line ministries have been encouraged and supported to participate, through awareness-raising, training seminars, bilateral feedback, the development of methods and tools (including use of the Swedish 3-R method) and sex-disaggregation of data involving National Statistics. Involvement in international debates on gender budgeting have also been useful.

Positive achievements are the inclusion of gender equality in staff policy in the mainstream budget process, the placing of gender issues more broadly on the agenda in all Ministries, support from the Parliament, cooperation between budget and gender expertise, and between different departments and the Ministry of Children and Family Affairs, and the production of concrete examples to help argue the case for gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting.

There have also been weaknesses of the GB initiative. It is not yet in the mainstream budget process and it is not actively used by Parliament for debating and adopting the state budget. There is insufficient political support and no statutory duty to report. The weak attention by civil society and the research community has not helped. The analyses are limited to micro-level and to expenditure (none on revenue), and there has been no strategic vision in the selection of areas for analysis. The quality of the analyses and the absence of agreed methods and tools have also been weaknesses of the GB initiative.

Anne Havnør also mentioned some of the international and Nordic initiatives on gender budgeting that should prove useful. These include a joint Nordic project on gender budgeting, involving cooperation between Ministries of Finance and gender equality authorities, and a report of the Council of European Group of Experts on gender budgeting, due at the end of 2004.

In closing her presentation, Anne Havnør outlined some lines of thought, based on Norway's experiences. Gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting need to be complemented by specific action to promote gender equality, including gender equality legislation and institutional mechanisms. Internal Government initiatives cannot go beyond the ambitions of that Government, and outside initiatives fail unless they can elicit sufficient political support and follow-up. Parliament is in a pivotal position, and there is a need too for active lobbying by civil society. Alliances and networks should involve NGOs and the gender research community, as well as feminists in political parties and within the government administration. Gender equality must be inclusive and take other axes of discrimination into account. Many of the burning issues today, Ms Havnør observed, are at the intersection of ethnicity/race and gender, involve double or multiple discrimination. Finally, there is a need to move away from the perception of gender as a purely women's issue. Men and

masculinity must not be left unquestioned. For example, to eradicate sexual violence, male perpetrators need to be tackled as well as female victims of assault.

Elizabeth Villagómez's presentation continued the focus on gender budgeting, which might also be called "gender responsive budgets", or "women's budgets". Gender responsive budgeting (GRB) is an effort to disaggregate the general government budget in terms of its impact on men and women, and on different groups of men and women, taking due notice of gender relations. Budgets include not only expenditure; gender budgeting can and should also cover the income of government (taxes, charges for public services, tariffs, etc).

GRB is being undertaken to respond to international commitments concerning equality in the distribution, access and funding of public resources, such those made in the context of CEDAW and Beijing + 5. GRB is also a tool that can be used to achieve various governance objectives, including transparency, efficiency and accountability. It can contribute to improved effectiveness of public policies and economic growth.

Gender budgeting can be undertaken inside or outside Government, by Parliaments and involving collaboration between external experts or organisations and Government departments. Taking the budget cycle into account is essential, timing GRB to have most influence on budgetary decision-making. Some budgets are easier for GRB than others: performance-oriented (or results-oriented) budgets are easier, because there are indicators.

Mieke Verloo focused her presentation on the challenges in gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting. The social construction of gender, she argued, recognises differences and changes. Gender is therefore a "moving" target, and a political target. The strengths of gender mainstreaming are that it addresses the structures of gender equality and sees the state as part of the problem. It is not supposed to be "one-off", and takes into account relations between women and men and sexuality, not just the category "women". But gender mainstreaming has weaknesses; its diffuseness and the difficulty of moving from theory to practice with perversion of the objective on the way. Ms Villa-Gomez referred to gender equality's contribution to productivity, as an argument in support of gender equality – but does productivity contribute to gender equality? Where is the "win-win" in the current focus on productivity? One of the "perverted" uses of gender equality, evident in Austria and the Netherlands, is to focus on poor men (but not on men and masculinity as a contribution to gender equality).

GRB has a number of strengths, according to Ms Verloo. It addresses money and the distribution of resources, it has much clearer objectives than gender mainstreaming, it is producing useful practices and it is (or should be) organised in a yearly cycle, asking for repetition and a systematic, cyclical approach. It also has the potential, if done thoroughly, to make transparent – and to challenge - the rules defining, for example, who is a citizen, what is a family, who is the partner of whom, etc. and to reveal the inconsistencies between policies and departments in the definitions and rules. If only sex-responsive budgeting is done, GRB will lose its strength as a tool for gender equality. Already, many practices fall short of the ideal: attaching a GRB as an

Annex to the finance bill or budget, or asking for a GRB (or gender impact assessment) without using the results.

Ms Verloo ended by giving her view of the challenges ahead for gender mainstreaming. Firstly, the concept of gender must include how gender identities and the rules on gender are organised, for example what the Government defines as a couple or a family. Addressing the intersectionalities between gender and other identities and discriminations is essential, especially given the use of gender equality to criticise the Muslim community or other minorities. The creation of other inequalities through gender equality must be avoided. This issue is very complex and political. Another challenge is to prevent the de-politicisation of gender mainstreaming. Treating gender mainstreaming as a technocratic tool is easier than an approach that gives women and men a voice; more participatory practices are required to put the politics back into gender mainstreaming. Finally, prioritisation is needed. Gender mainstreaming's all-encompassing approach is one of its weaknesses, and it is necessary not only to prioritise strategically important actions, but also to move on from pilot initiatives, to mainstream implementation.

3.5.3 Discussion points

Questions and comments from participants highlighted some of the potentials of gender analysis, as well as the weaknesses of many current approaches to gender mainstreaming. Gender analyses of budgets are important because they reflect Government priorities, but should not be the only targets for analysis. Gender analysis has the potential to expose gender biases in important policy areas affecting people's lives, such as economic policy, citizenship policy, rules governing marriage or transport. Sheila Quinn, from Ireland, mentioned the findings of a recent gender audit of three regional agencies in Ireland in which she had been involved, which had identified inconsistencies between gender equality and some "sacrosanct" economic policy principles. Elizabeth Villagómez noted, however, that awareness-raising might be needed before some difficult policy areas are tackled.

The subject of gender difference was also raised, which poses difficulties and some risks for gender equality policy. While noting that she would like to get rid of gender as a point of differentiation amongst people, Mieke Verloo argued the importance of making space for difference, while paying careful attention to the values attached to differences. One of the difficulties of making progress on gender equality, she argued, is the existence of so many definitions of gender and interpretations of gender equality (the subject of the MAGEEQ FP5-funded research project). Defining a clearer vision of gender equality and reaching consensus on the definition of gender would help to progress gender equality policy.

3.6 Gender equality and diversity: maintaining gender equality's specificities and resources within a broader equality approach

Following introductory words by the Chair (Mary Daly, Professor of Sociology, Queen's University Belfast), the two speakers gave their presentations: **Janet Veitch**, Director of the Women's National Commission (UK) and **Yvonne Strachan**, Head of

the Equality Unit of the Scottish Executive (UK). Janet Veitch focused on key concerns regarding the move towards an integrated approach to equality in the UK on the part of women's associations, which her organisation represents. Yvonne Strachan's presentation provided a succinct but also comprehensive description of the integrated approach to equality operating in Scotland since devolution, paying particular attention to the features deemed to be key to the success of the Scottish experience.

The third part of the workshop session consisted of an open discussion on issues that were raised by either Yvonne's or Janet's presentation. The Chair moderated this discussion by raising the following questions:

- 1) What is the meaning of generic equality?
- 2) What is the transformative potential of an integrated equality approach when compared to that of a gender-specific approach?
- 3) What are the differences, and also the possible conflict, between the gender problematic and other types of equality problematic (such as, e.g., age, sexual orientation, race, disability and so on)
- 4) Is the integrated approach a development of equal treatment approaches, which have dominated gender equality policy in Anglo-Saxon Countries?

The workshop session closed with a general summary by the Chairperson of the main points raised.

The rapporteur was Sara Clavero (School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen's University Belfast, UK).

3.6.1 Presentations

Janet Veitch opened her presentation with a brief description of her organisation and its place in the overall equality machinery currently in operation in the UK. Following this introduction she described the main issues that her organisation has been lobbying for in relation to the current move towards an integrated approach to equality in the UK (which include the introduction of a duty to promote equality for all and the enactment of single Equality Act). Janet Veitch raised three concerns about these developments. The first is a concern about how the future single equality commission (to be named the Commission for Equality and Human Rights) will distribute resources across the different equality areas. So far, the current commission dedicated to gender equality issues (Equal Opportunities Commission) has received less funding as compared to the funds allocated to the other two commissions (for race and disability). The second concern is the possibility that the voice of women will be diluted among the other voices. On this point, Janet made the interesting remark that the UK government tends to give higher priority to those equality areas where social stability is threatened, such as, for example, race equality issues. In contrast, those groups that make least trouble, such as trans-sexual women for example, are the least visible of all. This concern about the less visibility of gender is also connected with a general perception among the British public that women 'have it all' and that gender equality is no longer an issue. The third concern is about the existence of internal contradictions between the objectives of the different equality sectors. One example of such a conflict is that between the demands for gender equality by the women's groups and the demands from ethnic minority communities that their cultural practices

be respected, regardless of whether such culture may include discriminatory practices against women. Janet Veitch closed her presentation by putting forward the argument that a single focus on gender can be very beneficial for women.

Yvonne Strachan opened with a general description of the distinctive features of Scottish politics and society in relation to the rest of the UK. This was followed by an overview of the main features of equal opportunities policy in Scotland after devolution. After this introductory part, the remainder of the presentation focused on key issues around equality mainstreaming – the main approach taken to equal opportunities policy in Scotland. Ms Strachan focused on the benefits of such an approach (drawing on the Scottish experience so far) while countering a number of concerns regarding the move from a gender-focused policy towards an integrated approach. In her view, there are a number of attributes of Scottish equal opportunities policy, which have served to counter the highly debated potential of a generic approach to create a hierarchy of equalities. The first attribute is that Scottish equality policy, while being ‘general’, has succeeded in maintaining a focus on the needs of each group and also on each community of interest (including women). Secondly, in Scotland, all groups working for equality have a firm commitment to equality across the whole spectrum. Thirdly, Scottish equality policy is implemented using a partnership model, which is based on the participation of the different players in society. And finally, the fact that gender was at the centre of the equality debate during the establishment of the devolved institutions (thanks to the Scottish women’s movement which was quite vocal at the time) forestalled the potential of an integrated approach to render the gender ground invisible.

3.6.2 Discussion

The discussion opened with a question, raised by the Chair, about the meaning of a generic approach to equality. Yvonne Strachan answered this question by claiming that, in Scotland, a generic approach is both general and specific. In her view, an equality mainstreaming approach needs to keep a focus on the needs of each group and community of interests. In policy, this is achieved by implementing specific actions/interventions as part of the overall mainstreaming strategy. In other words, the implementation of equality mainstreaming should follow a ‘twin-track’ strategy or ‘dual’ approach, consisting of the implementation of both mainstreaming and positive action initiatives.

The second question raised by the Chair concerned the transformative potential of an integrated equality approach versus a specific approach that is focused on gender. In response to this question, a participant from Northern Ireland outlined a number of lessons which can be drawn from the Northern Irish experience of mainstreaming equality. In the first place, she claimed that, in Northern Ireland, equality mainstreaming policy – a policy that is underpinned by a statutory duty placed on public authorities to promote equality across nine different grounds, including gender – has a great potential to transform the lives of many women. In this regard she referred to the implementation of positive action programmes alongside mainstreaming, as well as to the fact that gender is impact-assessed in Northern Ireland as a single issue. She also stressed the potential of an integrated approach to tackle cases of multiple discrimination, and how, for example, a programme targeted

at the Traveller community (one of the most discriminated groups in Ireland) can transform significantly the lives of many women.

A very interesting issue that was debated during the discussion was whether and, if so, in what respect, the gender problematic, and therefore the objectives of a gender equality policy, are distinctive when compared to other equality concerns such as race, disability, age, sexual orientation and so on. In response to this question, Janet Veitch provided a brief analysis of the ‘distinctiveness’ of gender, listing a number of key differences. In the first place, there are significant quantitative differences between gender and the other equality sectors, as long as women are the single largest discriminated group. Secondly, a lot of issues linked to gender inequality take place in the private sphere (e.g., violence, care work) and are therefore invisible. As a result, there is very little empirical information about these issues as no reliable statistics are available. Finally, an important difference between gender and other equality ‘strands’ is that the demands of other equality groups are based on a politics of recognition while the demands of women are based on a politics of transformation, insofar as the principal aim of such politics is to change existing (male) norms.

The fourth issue discussed originated in a question, raised by the Chair, of whether an integrated approach to equality can be viewed as a direct development of equal treatment approaches, which have been dominant especially in Anglo-Saxon countries. Regarding this issue, a participant made the remark that the places where an integrated approach to equality has been pioneered and developed to a greater extent are the areas constituting the so-called ‘Celtic belt’ – namely Ireland (North and South), Scotland and Wales. According to this participant, these places have a number of characteristics in common. First, they have a strong tradition of ‘civic republicanism’, where civil society participation is key to the policy process. Secondly, they have experienced oppression from England and, in the cases of Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, a significant neglect on the part of the UK government during the period of conservative rule, of equality issues especially affecting them. This may partially explain why equality constituted a priority issue during the devolutionary process that took place in these regions at the end of the 1990s.

Other issues were also touched upon during the discussion, albeit more briefly than those described above. For example, regarding the concern about the allocation of resources among the different equality strands in an integrated model, a participant from Northern Ireland claimed that the recent amalgamation of the different equality commissions into a single equality body (that took place in the region as part of the Good Friday Agreement) has had very positive impact on the overall budget allocated to this body so that all equality areas have benefited as a result.

Chapter 4

Policy conclusions

A number of conclusions concerning gender equality policy can be drawn from the discussions at the EQUAPOL EU conference.

4.1 Progress and weaknesses of gender equality policy

Firstly, there is a clear consensus that progress has been achieved over recent years, particularly in establishing important mechanisms for the design and implementation of gender equality policy at European and national levels. These include legal and institutional mechanisms, as well as mechanisms for shaping policy-making so that gender issues are taken into account. Progress can be identified across the European Union, both in new Member States (particularly as a result of the *acquis communautaire*) and in “old” Member States, including countries that have strong and weak traditions of addressing gender equality.

It is much more difficult, however, to identify progress in terms of the outcomes of gender equality policy; this relates partly to the absence of clear objectives and of monitoring and evaluation (discussed below), partly to the fact that it may be too soon to judge the effectiveness of recent policy approaches, such as gender mainstreaming. Many speakers at the conference stressed that structural and societal changes take time, so a longer-time view is needed before the successes of recent policy approaches can be judged.

Nonetheless, there is a broad consensus about the weaknesses in the ways that gender mainstreaming is being implemented, and there are serious concerns about the potential of gender mainstreaming (at least as currently applied) to achieve the required changes in policy design and policy outcomes. These concerns are increased by an analysis of the current political and policy environment, which is widely considered to be negative for gender equality, at European level and in many Member States. This does not mean that progress cannot be made, but that new approaches are needed, both to secure the gains already achieved and to make further progress.

4.2 Vision and objectives of gender equality

One of the main policy conclusions is the need for a much clearer vision of the objectives of gender equality. One of the identified weaknesses of current approaches, most notably gender mainstreaming, is the focus on process at the expense of outcomes. While quantitative objectives have been elaborated (for example the gender indicators agreed under various Presidencies), particularly relating to employment, there is a near total absence of clear social goals and objectives relating to gender equality, even in countries such as Sweden where the principle of gender equality is strongly accepted in society and policy. This makes it difficult to win support for gender equality (what are the benefits, and for whom?) and to elaborate qualitative and quantitative indicators to measure achievements beyond specific policy areas or sectors.

Elaborating clear goals for gender equality policy raises some important issues:

- The first concerns the extent of the ability of public policy to influence gender equality, given the strength of deeper structural and social/cultural influences on gender identity and gender relations (patriarchy, capitalism, religion). What can be expected of gender equality policy, and what are its limits?
- The second concerns the place of gender in a “gender equal” society. Does this mean a society in which gender has “equal” value (i.e. women and men are valued equally, different sexual and gendered identities are treated equally) or one in which gender is not a point of differentiation at all?
- The third concerns what Mieke Verloo terms “intersectionality”, that is the interconnections between gender and other identities and discriminations. How to achieve gender equality while protecting other rights, especially of ethnic or religious groups that are characterized by marked gender differences and inequalities? Does a broader approach to equality weaken or strengthen the ability to advance gender equality?
- The fourth concerns the place of gender equality in political priorities, and of establishing gender equality goals that have a chance of gaining political support (and thus resources for implementation). In Sweden, gender equality succeeds because the accepted goal is a welfare society. How to establish gender equality goals that are coherent with the current political priorities of productivity and growth? Is this possible, or are the goals incompatible?
- A final issue concerns the participation of women in decision-making, and the extent to which the pursuit of gender equality – and gender equality policy – requires the equal participation of women and men in decision-making (and/or decision-making based in women’s needs and interests). It is often argued that men can also benefit from gender equality, but political will is needed to improve attention to gender equality in public policies and it is primarily women that stand to benefit from greater equality at home and in work. Equal participation in political and policy decisions is a minimum guarantee that gender equality will be taken into account.

4.3 Gender equality within a broader equality approach: maintaining the specificities of gender equality

Concerning how to progress gender equality within the context of a broader equality approach, some policy conclusions can be drawn. Gender experts and feminists agree about the specificities of gender, and that gender inequality is about particular types of power (patriarchy), rendering it different from discrimination on the basis of ethnicity or disability. This means that specific gender equality mechanisms (legal, institutional) and procedures (for dialogue, analysis and policy design) must be maintained, as well as positive actions to empower women and promote gender equality. Targeted resources, expertise in gender and gender-specific knowledge and information are also required. However, this can be achieved within a broader institutional framework, which addresses various forms of equality and discrimination. Indeed, there may be advantages – as examples from Scotland and Northern Ireland suggest – in terms of increased political support and resources, and the ability to build alliances across different “identity intersections” (gender and ethnicity, gender and age). Gender equality must not, however, be absorbed into a

broad equality approach so that it becomes invisible and stripped of resources, and must not be treated as merely an issue of “discrimination”. The issue is not so much if gender equality can or should be addressed within a broader equality approach, but how this can be done so that gender equality is adequately treated. As Agnès Hubert pointed out during the conference, a broader equality approach is on the agenda, and cannot be ignored.

One of the possible advantages of gender equality within a broader equality approach is tackling the problem posed by “universalism”. While feminists, for example in France, have had to deconstruct and tackle universalist concepts about democracy and policy, feminism itself has often been accused of applying similarly universalist concepts, treating women and men as homogeneous groups and ignoring the changing nature and diversity of women’s and men’s experiences and identities. The shallowness of some gender analysis and gender policy is clearly due to the use of over-simplified gender constructs (comparing “women” to “men”). Strengthening analyses and policy-making on gender equality by taking into account the diversity of identities and experiences is an important policy challenge.

4.4 Gender mainstreaming: more robust implementation

Concerning gender mainstreaming, the policy conclusions are clear. More time is needed to determine the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming as a strategy. Gender mainstreaming has many strengths: it addresses structural change and gender relations (not just women and men); it challenges the neutrality of policy and has developed methods and procedures for assessing and amending policies; it implies a consistent, continuous process across all policy domains; and it engages a broad range of actors in its implementation. However, some of its strengths are also its weaknesses: it is being applied thinly and without depth; everyone – and no-one – is responsible for its implementation; and it has focused too much on instruments and procedures and insufficiently on political support and broad stakeholder participation. Gender mainstreaming has become the objective, not gender equality, and the proliferation of jargon has made it difficult to gain broad understanding and support.

More robust efforts are needed to strengthen the implementation of gender mainstreaming in policy. Firstly, establishing strategic priorities and focusing efforts on priority areas is essential. This means identifying strategic “entry points” for gender - within a policy domain and policy cycle - that have the greatest chances to progress gender equality. Going “mainstream” is also vital; there should no longer be only pilot projects and “stand-alone, short-term” initiatives. More systematic use of gender analysis and gender budgeting in the context of mainstream budgetary processes and policy reviews could bring significant benefits.

4.5 Policy priorities

There are some emerging conclusions in terms of policy issues to be addressed. Policies to promote a multicultural and multi-ethnic Europe, and to support gender equality and social integration and anti-discrimination, are an important priority. Gender, violence and conflict need considerably more attention and resources. DAPHNE has been an important start, but this needs to be scaled-up and tackled in a more mainstream way. Moreover, men’s role in violence and conflict must be given

considerably more attention, as well as women's role in peace-building. Gender and sustainable development, and gender and macro-economic policy, also require more attention.

Efforts to give gender equality more policy weight are important, so that it yields less to other policy priorities during policy formulation and decision-making. This can be done by establishing clear links between gender equality and the main policy objectives (defining the “win-win” objectives). However, it is not clear that gender equality and the EU's economic growth and productivity agenda are fully compatible, and dialogue on gender equality can contribute to defining alternative objectives that better reflect the aspirations of women and men and contribute to strengthening other policy commitments (e.g. protection of human rights, social integration, environmental sustainability).

4.6 Broader stakeholder participation and stronger alliances

One of the clear policy conclusions is that gender equality policy and gender mainstreaming cannot be left to policy-makers alone, and cannot be left to male-dominated policy-making structures. To progress gender equality, a much wider range of stakeholders needs to be involved in policy dialogue and policy-making, and many more women. This means establishing structured mechanisms for engaging stakeholders outside the state and parliament in policy dialogue, and promoting two-way mechanisms of dialogue not merely one-way consultation. Parliamentary and Government committees on gender equality can include stakeholders from civil society and the private sector. And it means making much more rapid progress on implementing commitments to the equal participation of women and men in decision-making.

More participatory methods of gender analysis and policy development should be used, involving women's organizations, gender experts and researchers. Stronger alliances are needed, across the political spectrum and across different types of stakeholder (civil society, private sector, research, government, parliament). In this way, the knowledge-base of policy assessment and formulation can be improved, and links can be better made between public policy and other spheres of action on gender equality.

4.7 Strengthening the knowledge-base on gender

A strong conclusion for the development of gender equality policy is the need to reinforce knowledge about gender and gender inequality. This does not mean only quantitative data, but also qualitative research, especially on how gender inequality is maintained and on the intersections between gender and other identities and discriminations. Even in the Nordic countries, where there has been considerable investment in gender research, there is a need for more research and information, particularly related to important policy areas. Stronger and more sustained support for gender studies in universities and continued European funding of gender, and gendered, research are needed.

4.8 Using all possible resources and mechanisms

A final conclusion concerns how to progress gender equality policy in the current difficult environment. Debates about the advantages and disadvantages of the Constitutional Treaty or the proposed European Gender Institute (EGI) are important, but considerable realism is needed when taking a decision to support or not to support such initiatives. A double-track approach is needed, which makes the most of all current opportunities and mechanisms that can support gender equality (the Treaty, the EGI, anti-discrimination and human rights initiatives) and which lobbies and argues robustly for stronger attention to gender equality and for increased resources and positive action.

Appendix 1: Conference Programme

THURSDAY NOVEMBER 25 2004	
8.30-9.30	Registration
9.00-9.30	Welcome by <i>Eugenia Tsoumani</i> , General Secretary for Equality
9.30-11.30	<p><u>Plenary Session</u></p> <p>Chair: <i>Prof Koula Kassimati</i>, Director, KEKMOKOP, Dept of Social Policy, Panteion University</p> <p>Gender Research in FP5 and FP6: experiences and challenges <i>Myria Vassiliadou</i>, Scientific Officer, Unit “Social and Human Sciences Research”, DG Research, European Commission</p> <p>EQUAPOL: progress of gender equality in public policy in the study countries – a comparative analysis <i>Prof Mary Daly</i>, Professor of Sociology, School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen’s University Belfast, UK</p> <p>EQUAPOL: progress in a European and international perspective <i>Mary Braithwaite</i>, Scientific Coordinator, EQUAPOL, KEKMOKOP</p>
11.30-12.00	Break
12.00-13.30	<p><u>Plenary Session</u></p> <p>Chair: <i>Prof Loukia Moussourou</i>, Dept of Social Policy, Panteion University</p> <p>How should gender mainstreaming practice be taken forward? <i>Gertrud Åström</i>, leading Swedish gender equality expert</p> <p>National and EU gender equality policy: opportunities for progress <i>Anna Karamanou</i>, ex-President of EP Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality</p>
13.30-14.30	Lunch
14.30-16.30	<p><u>Three Parallel Workshops:</u></p> <p>1st workshop: Gender equality and inequality in education: challenging gendered power structures and gender stereotypes <u>Coordinator:</u> <i>Mari Runardotter</i>, Researcher, Dept of Human Work Sciences, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u> <i>Gertrud Åström</i>, Swedish gender equality expert <i>Assoc Prof Christina Mörtberg</i>, Dept of Human Work Sciences, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden</p> <p>2nd workshop: Changing face of Europe: The Constitution and new legal framework for gender equality <u>Coordinator:</u> <i>Maria Stratigaki</i>, Scientific Responsible, EQUAPOL, Dept of Social Policy, Panteion University</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u> <i>Sofia Spiliotopoulou</i>, Attorney at Law, Vice-President of European Women’s Lawyers Association and Vice-President of Association des Femmes de l’Europe Méridionales <i>Emanuela Lombardo</i>, Senior Researcher MAGEEQ, Dept of Politics, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain</p>

14.30-16.30	<p>3rd workshop: The European Gender Institute: hopes, concerns and priorities for its establishment</p> <p><u>Coordinator:</u> <i>Mary Braithwaite</i>, Scientific Coordinator, EQUAPOL, KEKMOKOP</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u> <i>Agnès Hubert</i>, Member of the Group of Political Advisors of the President of the European Commission <i>Lut Mergaert</i>, Yellow Window Management Consultants, Belgium (author of feasibility study for European Parliament on the European Gender Institute)</p>
16.30-17.00	Break
17.00-19.00	<p><u>Three Parallel Workshops:</u></p> <p>4th workshop: Gender studies and gender policy: links and synergies</p> <p><u>Coordinator and speaker:</u> <i>Maria Stratigaki</i>, Scientific Responsible, EQUAPOL, Dept of Social Policy, Panteion University</p> <p><u>Speaker:</u> <i>Savvatu Tsolakidou</i>, Head of Unit “Projects for linking education with the labour market”, Operational Programme for Education and Initial Vocational Training (EPEAEK), Ministry of Education, Greece</p> <p>5th workshop: Gender analysis and gender budgeting: progress in gender mainstreaming</p> <p><u>Coordinator:</u> <i>Mary Braithwaite</i>, Scientific Coordinator, EQUAPOL, KEKMOKOP</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u> <i>Anne Havnør</i>, Senior Advisor, Department for Family Affairs, Child Care and Gender Equality, Ministry of Children and Family Affairs, Norway <i>Mieke Verloo</i>, Lecturer in Political Science and Women’s Studies, Radboud University, Netherlands, and Research Director of MAGEEQ project, Institute of Human Sciences, Vienna, Austria <i>Elizabeth Villagómez</i>, Senior Partner, Almenara Economic and Social Studies, Madrid, Spain</p> <p>6th workshop: Gender equality and diversity: maintaining gender equality’s specificities and resources in the context of a broader equality approach</p> <p><u>Coordinators:</u> <i>Prof Mary Daly</i>, Professor of Sociology, and <i>Sara Clavero</i>, Researcher, School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen’s University Belfast, UK</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u> <i>Yvonne Strachan</i>, Head of Equality Unit, Scottish Executive, UK <i>Janet Veitch</i>, Director, Women’s National Commission, UK</p>
20.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dinner reception • Photo Exhibition “Afghanistan 2004” by Nikianna Sianou, Centre for Research and Action on Peace (KEDE) • Music by Duo “Vojo & Boban”

	FRIDAY NOVEMBER 26 2004
9.00-11.00	<p><u>Plenary Session</u> Chair: Prof Nikos Kokosalakis, <i>Scientific Advisor, EQUAPOL, KEKMOKOP</i></p> <p>Feedback from the thematic workshops: Making progress on gender equality and gender mainstreaming Sara Clavero, <i>School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen's University Belfast, UK</i> Mari Runardotter, <i>Researcher, Dept of Human Work Sciences, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden</i> Maria Stratigaki, <i>Scientific Responsible, EQUAPOL, Dept of Social Policy, Panteion University</i> Mary Braithwaite, <i>Scientific Coordinator, EQUAPOL, KEKMOKOP</i></p>
11.00-11.30	Break
11.30-13.30	<p><u>Plenary Session</u> Chair: Maria Stratigaki, <i>Scientific Responsible, EQUAPOL, Dept of Social Policy, Panteion University</i></p> <p>Round Table: Policies and practice on gender equality in the European Union: views on the future Ausra Gribauskiénė, <i>Senior Specialist, Science Division, Department of Science and Higher Education, Lithuania</i> Ilute Lāce, <i>Vice-President, European Women's Lobby, Latvia</i> Agnès Hubert, <i>Member of the Group of Political Advisors of the President of the European Commission</i> Mieke Verloo, <i>Lecturer in Political Science and Women's Studies, Radboud University, Netherlands, and Research Director of MAGEEQ project, Institute of Human Sciences, Vienna, Austria</i> Yvonne Strachan, <i>Head of Equality Unit, Scottish Executive, UK</i></p>
13.30	Lunch

Appendix 2: Conference Participants

	SURNAME	FIRST NAME	INSTITUTION
1	ASTROM	GERTRUD	Ministry of Industry, Sweden
2	BRAITHWAITE	MARY	KEKMOKOP / TACITUS
3	CHARPENTIER	LOUIS	European Agency for Reconstruction
4	CLAVERO	SARA	School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen's Univ. of Belfast, UK
5	DALY	MARY	School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen's Univ. Of Belfast, UK
7	DENIS	ALAIN	Yellow Window Management Consultants, Belgium
8	GRIBAUŠKIENE	AUSRA	Science Division at the Department of Science and Higher Education, Lithuania
9	HAVNØR	ANNE	Ministry of Children and Family Affairs of Norway. Department of Family Affairs, Child Care and Gender Equality, Norway
10	HUBERT	AGNES	European Commission
11	KINGSTON	IRENE	Equality Commission Northern Ireland, UK
12	KURAPKA	VIDMANTAS EGIDIJUS	Law University of Lithuania
13	KUSEDOVA	VIERA	Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, Slovakia
14	LACE	ILUTA	European Women's Lobby, Latvia
15	LEERSCHOLL	BART	UN
16	LOMBARDO	EMANUELA	Dept. of Politics, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain
17	LOOS	MARTINA	University of Ioannina
18	MARTUCCI	CHIARA	Universita di Milano, Italy
19	MAYERL	ROLAND	City & Shelter Belgium
20	MERGAERT	LUT	Yellow Window Management Consultants, Belgium
21	MICALLEF	DOREEN	National Council of Women Malta
22	MORTBERG	CHRISTINA	Division Gender & Technology, Lulea University of Technology, Sweden
23	PLASMAN	ROBERT	Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium
24	QUINN	SHEILA	Researcher & Policy Consultant, Ireland
25	RAMIREZ ROUVALIS	RELIA	Radio Education
26	RUNARÐOTTER	MARI	Dept. of Human Work Sciences, Lulea University of Technology, Sweden
27	SILVELL	MONICA	Division for Gender Equality, Ministry of Industry, Employment & Communications, Sweden
28	SISSOKO	SALIMATA	Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium
29	STRACHAN	YVONNE	Scottish Executive, UK
30	TALJUNAITE	MEILUTE	Law University of Lithuania
31	VEITCH	JANET	Women's National Commission, UK
32	VERLOO	MIEKE	Political Science and Women's Studies, University of Radboud, Netherlands

33	VILLAGOMEZ	ELIZABETH	Almenara Estudios Economicos y Sociales, Spain
34	VINGELIS	LINAS	Head of the Department of Education, Science and Culture, Lithuania
35	AGIANOZOGLOU	OLGA	Panteion University
36	ALEXANDROPOULOU	SOPHIA	Panteion University
37	ALIPRANTI - MARATO	LAURA	National Centre for Social Research EKKE
38	ANAGNOSTOS	NIKOLAOS	Panteion University
39	ANTONIOU	APOSTOLOS	Panteion University
40	ARAVOPOULOU	SOPHIA	Athens Press Agency
41	ARGYRIOU	KATHERINA-SOTIRIA	Panteion University
42	ATESSOGLU	ATHINA	KEKMOKOP
43	AVGOUSTINOS	IOANNIS	KEKMOKOP
44	VAIOU	LYDIA	Athens University
45	VAIOU	DINA	National Technical University of Athens
46	VASILEIADOU	MYRIA	DG Research, European Commission
47	VENIOPOULOU	KYRA	Management Operation Unit
48	VLAHOU	KATHERINE	Panteion University
49	VOKOTOUZI	FLORENCE	AMEL SA
50	VOSNIADOU	STELLA	National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
51	VOYGIOUKA	ANNE	TEDK Prefecture of Corinth
52	VOUMVOUNAKI	HELEN	Ministry of National Education
53	VYTIMA	ALICE	Operational Programme for Education and Initial Vocational Training (EPEAEK) Ministry of Education
54	GATSIU	ELSA	Women's Union of Epirus
55	GEORGIU	KONSTANTINO	Techological Educational Institute of Patras
56	GIDARAKOU	ISABELLA	Agricultural University of Athens
57	GIOTOPOULOU	IOANNA	Dir. for Social Protection and Health of the Municipality of Athens - Secretariat of Equality
58	GIOTOPOULOU	ANNA	Municipality of Ag. Dimitrios
59	GAZON	ERIK	Horizontal Women's Action, Panteion University
60	GOULIAROU	ATHINA	Women's Network of Thessaloniki
61	DAFOPOULOS	VANGELIS	Panteion University
62	DELISTATHIS	ALEXANDROS	Research Centre for Gender Equality (KETHI)
63	DIMITRIADIS	DIMITRIS	Olympic Airways
64	DIMITRIADOU	THEKLA	Panteion University
65	DIMOU	EFROSINI	KETHI
66	DIAMANTI	STELLA	General Confederation of Greek Agrarian Associations GESASE
67	DOUKA SIKAKI	ALEKA	Confederation of Women for Family and Youth - ENEON Greece
68	THANOPOULOU	MARIA	National Centre for Social Research -EKKE
69	THELERITI	MARIA	TEDK Prefecture of Corinth
70	INGLESSI	HRISI	Athens University
71	KAVADIA	ANNE	Thessaloniki University
72	KAINANA	CHRISTINE	Panteion University
73	KALIVEZA	MATINA	KETHI
74	KAMATSOU	EFROSINI	Panteion University

75	KAMOUTSI	FREY	National Centre for Social Research –EKKE
76	KANTA	VICKY	KETHI
77	KADARAKI	MAROULA	University of Thessalia
78	KANZARA	VASILIKI	Panteion University
79	KARAGIANNOPOULOU	HARA	Panteion University
80	KARAMANOU	ANNA	Former Member of European Parliament
81	KARAMANTOPOULOU	HELEN	Panteion University
82	KARAMESINI	MARIA	Panteion University
83	KASSIMATI	KOULA	Panteion University
84	KATOUFFA	HELEN	Journalist
85	KATSAITI	EVANGELIA	KETHI
86	KATSI	IFIGENIA	Mediterranean Institute for Gender Research
87	KOKOSSALAKIS	NIKOLAOS	KEKMOKOP
88	KOLATSI	FLORA	Panteion University
89	KOLOKITHA	ELIA	Association for Women's Affair
90	KORAKI	MARIA	Centre for Gender Studies
91	KORDONOURI	KATHERINE	12th Lyceum of Athens
92	KOSSOS	ANASTASIOS	EUROBANK
93	KOTALAKIDIS	GRIGORIOS	AKMON - Centre for Occupational Direction
94	KOTZIAS	STAMATIS	Panteion University
95	KOUVAKI	VASILIKI	University of Ioannina
96	KOULIA	KONSTANTINA	KETHI
97	KOUPAROUSSOU	HELEN	KETHI
98	KOURMOULI	ANNE - MARIA	
99	KOUFIOTI	MARIA	KETHI
100	ΛΑΜΙΠΙΝΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ	TERPSI	Association for Women's Rights
101	LEGAKI	MARIA	University of Creta
102	LEONTIDOU	EFTIHIA	Feminist Network
103	LYKISSAS	GEORGE	
104	MEIDANI	MARINE	Panteion University
105	MILTOU - KARAVIA	IOANNA	Feminist Network
106	MIHAIL	MARIA	Panteion University
107	MORFOULI	KIRIAKI	Panteion University
108	MOTSOU	VASIA	Hellenic Confederation of Professional Craftsmen and Merchants GSEVEE-Greece
109	MOURIKI	ALICE	National Centre for Social Research –EKKE
110	MOUSOU	VASIA	GSEVEE
111	MOUSSOUROU	LUCIA	Panteion University
112	BAGIA	ANTONIA	Social Care and Health Municipality of Athens-
113	BEGA	IOANNA	AMEL AE
114	BEGOU	VAGIA	Panteion University
115	BEKOU	EFI	General Secretary of Equalitty
116	BIRI	ANTONIA	Labour Ministry Greece
117	NIKLITSIOTIS	GEORGE	Panteion University
118	NIKA	ALEXANDRA	Social Care and Health Municipality of Athens
119	NIKITOGLOU	ROXANI	KETHI
120	NICKOLAOU	IOANNIS	Greek Open University
121	NICKOLAOU	MARIA	Panteion University
122	XANTHOULI	AMERISSA	Panteion University
123	XENAKI	IOANNA	Panteion University

124	OIKONOMOY	MARINE	Panteion University
125	PAPAGEORGIOU - MARTZOUKOU	RENA	Municipality of Vironas
126	PANTELIDOU- MALOUTA	MARO	Athens University
127	PAPADATOU	SOPHIA	YDT
128	PAPAEFTHIMIOU	VASILIKI	Social Care and Health Municipality of Athens
129	PAPATREHA	IRENE	AMEL AE
130	PAPOTI	EVANGELIA	Private School
131	PASSIAS	HARIS	Panteion University
132	PENTARAKI	MARIA	Techological Institute of Patra
133	PIROUNAKI	KALLIOPI	General Women's Union
134	POULAKI	MEROPI	Panteion University
135	PROKOU	HELEN	Panteion University
136	PILARINOS	SRIROS	General Secretariat of Equality Greece
137	REPA	PARASKEVI	General Secretariat for Research and Technology
138	REPOUSSI	MARIA	University of Thessaloniki
139	ROVOLA	GEORGIA	Panteion University
140	ROUBAKOU	ARGIRO	Ministry of Agriculture Development Greece
141	SALVARA	LABRINI - DAFNI	Panteion University
142	SAMIOU	DIMITRA	Kapodistriako University of Athens
143	SANDROUS	MARIA	General Secretary of Equality
144	SARRI	MARY	Athens Chamber of Commerce and Industry
145	SGOURAKI	GEORGIA	Panteion University
146	SERETI	NATALIA	Dir. of Foreigners and Immigrants
147	SAMRGIANNAKI	EFROSINI	Social Care and Health Municipality of Athens
148	SPATHARA	EVANGELIA	Private School
149	SPANODIMOU	STAVROULA	Panteion University
150	SPILIOTOPOULOU	SOPHIA	European Women Lawyers Association (EWLA), Association des Femmes de l' Europe Meridionales (AFEM)
151	SRYRIDAKI	ELEANA	KEKMOKOP
152	STAVROPOULOU	ARETI	Panteion University
153	STRATIGAKI	MARIA	Panteion University
154	STYLIANOU	ELEANA	
155	SYMEONIDOU	HARIS	EKKE Greece
156	SOCRATOUS	CHRISTINE	Panteion University
157	TAKI	PARASKEVI	Primary School of Thessaloniki
158	TZEPINKLI	MAGDALINE	Panteion University
159	TZOUKAS	VANGELIS	Panteion University
160	TIGANI	SOTIRIA	Panteion University
161	TOMPOULIDIS	ALEXIOS	Panteion University
162	TOUNTA	HELEN	Municipal Agency of Development of Municipality of Zografou
163	TOURI	PARASKEVI	KETHI Greece
164	TRIANTOU	LABRINI	Development Agency of the Prefecture of Karditsa
165	TRYFONAS	SRYRIDON	KEKMOKOP
166	TSAGARAKI	VASILIKI	
167	TSAGOURNI	HELEN	Panteion University

168	TSANIRA	EVELYN	National Centre for Social Research
169	TSELOU	SOPHIA	Panteion University
170	TSIANTA	PARASKEVI	Panteion University
171	TSOLAKIDOU	SAVVATOU	EPEAEK Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs
172	TSOUTSOU	MARIA - REA	Lyceum of Greek Women
173	FATOUROU-HARITOU	MIKA	Thessaloniki University
174	FILOPOULOU	OURANIA	Panteion University
175	FLAKA	KATHERINE	Greek Manpower Employment Organization
176	FLOROU	NATALIE	Panteion University
177	FOLEROU	FANI	
178	FRAGIADAKI	MARIA	Women's Secretary of GSSE
179	FRAGOUDI	IOULIA	KETHI
180	FREIDERIKOU	ALEXANDRA	
181	FRONIMOU	EMI	EKKE
182	HADJIANTONIOU	THEODORA	Panteion University
183	HRISANTHOPOULOU	EVANGELIA	Ministry of Development
184	HRISIKOPOULOU	MARY	Panaitoloacarnanian Women's Union
185	HRISOULI	HELEN	Panteion University
186	PSARIOTIS	IOANNIS	Kapodistriako University of Athens
187	PSAROMALLOU	REGINA	Municipal Agency of Development of Municipality of Zografou