

Feminist Foreign Policy Discussion Series Furthering Accountability & Centering Climate Change

A Discussion Summary

September 2019



AUTHORS:

Lyric Thompson of the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) and Tara Daniel of the Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO).

RECOMMENDED CITATION:

Thompson, L., and Daniel, T. (2019). *Feminist Foreign Policy Discussion Series: Furthering Accountability and Centering Climate Change*. Washington, DC: International Center for Research on Women.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

With thanks to the following individuals for their expertise and contributions:

Bridget Burns, Women's Environment and Development Organization
Catherine Nyambura, FEMNET
Diana Sarosi, Oxfam Canada
Erin Hohlfelder, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Eugenia López Uribe, Girls Not Brides: The Global Partnership to End Child Marriage
Geeta Misra, CREA
Hanni Hanson, Compton Foundation
Ndana Bofu-Tawamba, Urgent Action Fund Africa

Discussion Background

With the recent launch of explicitly-labeled “feminist” foreign policies (Sweden 2014, France 2019) and international assistance policies (Canada 2017), the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) has undertaken a stream of research and policy analysis to understand [how countries are structuring their efforts](#) and a series of global consultations to document [feminist civil society’s visions and recommendations](#). The aim is to set a global standard for feminist foreign policy (FFP) that centers feminist visions and adheres accountability to its goals (Thompson & Clement, 2019; Ridge et al., 2019).

As part of this work, ICRW and the Women’s Environment and Development Organization (WEDO) convened a discussion on June 5, 2019 at the Women Deliver Conference in Vancouver, Canada. These conversations delved deeper into the topic of climate change and theorized how feminist foreign policy could be structured to ensure not only the advancement of gender equality and women’s human rights but environmental integrity, especially in the context of a global climate crisis that disproportionately impacts women and minority groups.

The discussion included approximately forty civil society feminists from Australia, Bolivia, Canada, Costa Rica, Fiji, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, the United Kingdom and the United States. Ahead of the convening, participants were provided with a reading list that included [Sweden’s Feminist Foreign Policy](#), Canada’s Feminist International Assistance Policy (FIAP), [a paper by Oxfam Canada outlining principles and recommendations for feminist aid](#) and two papers by ICRW. One of ICRW’s papers [summarizes Swedish, Canadian and French policies and attempts to distill a draft definition of feminist foreign policy](#). The second paper articulates [outcomes of a consultation among 40 global feminists](#) that lay the groundwork for developing key principles and accountability mechanisms intended for use in crafting feminist foreign policies in the future (Government of Sweden, 2018; Government of Canada, 2018; Sarosi & Fernandes, 2019; Thompson & Clement, 2019; Ridge et al., 2019).

The convening began with welcome remarks from the hosts and framing remarks from three experts on climate change, feminist organizing and the Canadian Feminist International Assistance Policy — the only participating government to include climate in their FFP. Each expert reflected on critical questions regarding the concept of foreign policy and how it can be held accountable to feminist principles, particularly in the context of the global climate crisis. As feminism focuses on the collective and foreign policy has traditionally been a tool to serve national interests, speakers explored the tension between these two ideological orientations.

Following opening presentations by the expert panel, workshop participants then broke out into small groups to discuss FFP in the context of three thematic areas: 1) Climate Change and FFP; 2) Financing FFP; and 3) Global South Models for FFP. Through the course of the discussion, they formulated key principles to serve as the core to FFP and deliberated what accountability mechanisms would be required to ensure the success of FFP.

These themes are not representative of the full range of thematic issues that could have been discussed or where participants had expertise, which is a limitation of the workshop and resulting report. Additionally, this was a small sample from which to draw large conclusions. There was insufficient capacity to accommodate all interested participants, and not all participants were able to attend either the Women Deliver conference or this event given scheduling and financial constraints, as well as denied visa requests. Although diversity of geography, age and ability were sought, representation by feminists from the Middle East and North Africa and feminists with a range of abilities was not optimal. Meanwhile, donor country voices were over-represented, and the limited time available prevented participants from fully exploring all the issues and questions that were raised. In addition to the time constraints at the workshop, time was somewhat limited between the distribution of invitations and pre-reading materials. The resulting report from the discussion is limited by these and other constraints, but it nonetheless makes an important contribution in the ongoing effort to define, refine and enhance a feminist approach to foreign policy globally.

Discussion Outcomes and Key Themes: Expert Panel

The discussion opened with a critical examination of increasing right-wing backlash and closing civil society space juxtaposed against a rising class of leaders who often see a political win in calling themselves feminists. This does present both opportunities and risks for feminists in civil society who are seeking to inform these efforts and hold duty-bearers to account. On one hand, it is an opportunity to mobilize attention and resources to issues that urgently need it. On the other hand, there is tremendous risk of rhetoric outstripping resources and resulting in empty mandates and “pink-washing.” The goal of the discussion was to surface feminist civil society proposals for feminist foreign policy that tackle structural and systemic issues, while also providing practical guidance on how efforts should be shaped moving forward.

The following summary captures key themes of the consultation’s opening presentations, which were made by Noelene Nabulivou, co-founder and political advisor of Diverse Voices and Action for Equality (DIVA for Equality); Geeta Misra, executive director of CREA; and Diana Sarosi, manager of policy at Oxfam Canada. Key themes and recommendations from thematic breakout group discussions follow thereafter.

I. Importance of Intersectionality: Defending the spectrum of rights across identities, “isms,” domestic and global policies

Each opening speaker emphasized the importance of intersectionality — or an approach taking into account the interlinkages between and among issues — as a guiding principle for feminist foreign policy. In this case, feminism is not simply about women but should also actively seek to disrupt and shift discriminatory norms across various “isms”: neocolonialism, racism, sexism and the like. This includes not only women’s human rights but — among others — the rights of rural and indigenous peoples, LGBTQ+ people, people with disabilities and those most impacted by climate change.

The discussion emphasized the importance of nuance around different types of feminism — linking discussions of bodies, territories and biosphere, as well as connecting bodily autonomy with lives and the environment. Experts also

discussed the intersection between domestic and foreign policy, as manifested in the treatment of immigrants; ethnic minorities, including the Roma people in Europe, where two out of three current FFPs have been crafted; and the tribulations of family separation in contexts like the United States. Sex workers were another key population discussed, specifically in the context of Sweden’s FFP. One speaker felt that the Roma in Sweden have access to fewer services than people in India — and similarly problematized poor treatment of indigenous populations and nations within nation-states that trumpet feminism on the global stage. On the other hand, Sweden’s domestic efforts to protect habitats and resources of minority populations were raised as a positive example that might be emulated through its diplomatic relations with countries like India, where habitat and resource protections are of a real concern.

Speakers expressed concern that there is generally little attention paid to domestic policies that have not been named or affirmed as feminist, and they called for FFP frameworks that would unite global and domestic policy under the same common principles. This also was raised as an opportunity for global south governments, potentially including Mexico, to pen FFPs and decouple FFP as an exercise from its global north — and potentially neocolonial — origins. As one speaker put it, “if domestic policies are not being developed as feminist because it’s thought to be too big and wide, then this is also too big and too wide in the foreign policy framing.”

II. Advancing Institutional and Systemic Change

“Can a well-intentioned FFP dismantle inequalities and systems of oppression that have been in place for decades?” was the question of the day. Speakers emphasized that in order to live up to the feminist mantle, FFPs must be designed with the intent to rehaul the status quo. This would include reprioritizing the global economic system and parameters of trade, expanding ideas of who constitutes a citizen and has rights and prioritizing people and planet above growth and profit. This means naming and seeking to correct injustice within and between states, making transparent and accountable our financial transactions and transforming the movement of people, official development assistance (ODA) and climate finance. It

would also mean taking on the military-industrial complex, infusing equity in the realm of cross-border water issues and reigning in the power and privilege of extractive industries. An example raised was the decade activists spent trying to oust Nautilus Minerals, Inc. from Papua New Guinea, with tremendous costs in terms of resources and lives. The panel discussion also emphasized the rights of peoples from small island states as sea levels continue to rise.

The Bretton Woods Institutions and international financial institutions were also called on to adopt a feminist lens. The example of global climate finance was offered, which was supposed to be a transformative funding mechanism but whose resources are largely flowing to the same players “wrapped up in green bows.” Intersections between climate justice and reproductive justice were brought into the discussion, as well as big pharma and the proliferation of cervical cancer in the developing world, where testing and treatment are inaccessible to the people who need it and antimicrobial resistance threatens progress on global health outcomes. Finally, the primacy of agribusiness in foreign policy and export promotion was raised; its impacts on smallholder farmers (largely women) and local food systems need to be reviewed and revisited.

III. Policy Coherence: Feminist approaches across all policy levers

Speakers also raised the importance of policy coherence in FFP, addressing the tendency of countries to prioritize a gender lens in “soft power” elements of development while practices and priorities in “hard power” domains, like defense and trade, remain unchanged. Here the example of Sweden exporting arms to India was introduced, where in some states of India, people think of this practice as military occupation. On the other hand, when the Delhi gang rape occurred in 2012 aboard a bus in India, there was hope that more feminist governments would then put pressure on the Government to get rid of the Act that protects military forces with impunity for such crimes (marital rape was also cited).

IV. Global South Models for FFP

The prospect of global south country approaches to FFP were raised as a possible antidote to the neocolonial undertones of some exercises of FFP. Rumors that Mexico is developing an FFP sparked reflection on how this might shift the dynamic in a positive and progressive manner. Speakers imagined global south countries using FFP as a check against consumptive and neocolonial machinations of the global north. Examples included blocking potential deep sea mining in Canada and asserting the rights of people in small island states facing rising sea levels. Another example explored was the prevention of global north countries from opening up the high seas for their own gain, with FFP providing new framing around efforts to protect the Arctic, ending overfishing and preventing the absorption of all distance-water fisheries by those same countries.

V. Global North Models: FFP and aid

This is not to say that global north countries should not pursue more feminist foreign policies, and indeed, it may emerge as a tool to hold these countries to their promises to provide needed support to the global south, whose riches were in large part plundered by global north powers in the making of the current global economic order. At this point, a Canadian example was offered up as a case study for what global north country models of FFP might mean for restructuring donor approaches to foreign assistance, given that the Canadian policy’s scope is limited to foreign assistance. Through the FIAP, [Canada invested \\$300 million](#) in feminist grantmaking to directly support women’s rights organizations through the Equality Fund, as well as committed [\\$700 million a year over 10 years](#) for the neglected areas of sexual and reproductive health and rights (Equality Fund, 2019; Oxfam Canada, 2019). This example is illustrative of the “how” of FFP – how is rollout of the FIAP impacting the bureaucracy? The policy came about in a context of a “feminist government,” where there was a high-level commitment to substantive change. Nonetheless, efforts to implement the policy have been hampered by bureaucratic inertia, wherein a number of bureaucrats came of age during a conservative government and have reportedly struggled to think big when the universe of actors was largely unchanged.

Here the discussion featured Oxfam Canada's four principles and four recommendations for feminist aid:

[Principles for Feminist Aid \(Sarosi & Fernandes, 2019\):](#)

1. **Transformative change:** A transformative change approach seeks to redress the historical power imbalances between men and women. It challenges and shifts power relations and discriminatory social norms that devalue women and girls in all their diversity (and that have negative impacts on men and boys as well). Such approaches are long term and sustainable, and they often require collective action and strategies that work towards changes at multiple levels: within individuals, within households, within society and within institutions.
2. **Intersectionality:** Intersectionality refers to the multiple aspects of identity that play out in people's lives and experiences (such as gender, class, age, race, sexuality or ethnicity) and that can compound and exacerbate oppression. An intersectional approach in policy takes account the complex ways that multiple identities intersect and influence interests, participation and outcomes.
3. **Agency:** Agency is an individual or group's ability to make choices and to transform those choices into desired outcomes. Incorporating agency into policy requires contemplating issues of autonomy, choice, empowerment and meaningful engagement. A feminist lens on agency moves beyond seeing women as participants or beneficiaries; it means that women in all their diversity are experts on their own experience, agents of their own lives and actors in their community and society.
4. **Process:** A feminist policy prioritizes not only results (the advancement of the rights of women and girls) but the process used to achieve them (ways of working, program design and implementation, the values underpinning decisions). Fundamental aspects of feminist process include integrity, contextualization, learning, collaboration, participation, inclusivity and responsiveness.

[Recommendations for Feminist Aid \(Sarosi & Fernandes, 2019\):](#)

1. Make gender-based analysis mandatory across all aid strategies, frameworks, programming and monitoring, and ensure all aid integrates gender equality with at least one well-resourced intermediate level outcome that specifically addresses structural gender inequalities (i.e., scoring at least 1 on OECD gender markers).
2. Invest in stand-alone programming that addresses the structural causes of gender inequality, and significantly increase aid advancing gender equality as its principal focus (i.e., scoring 2 on OECD DAC gender markers).
3. Invest in women's rights and feminist organizations, and ensure that funding mechanisms foster their agency and sustainability.
4. Ensure feminist implementation that fosters agency and learning and applies feminist principles to monitoring and evaluation.

VI. FFP: Opportunities to transform rhetoric into reality

Speakers spent substantive time examining how FFPs might present an accountability mechanism by which rights-holders at home and abroad could hold duty-bearers to account. The mere exercise by a government of purporting to embrace feminism on a global stage affords activists an opportunity to assert rights and recommend action. Using an intersectional approach to feminism affords opportunities to do so at home and abroad.

The feminist principle of inclusion, for instance, would not allow governments to claim that they have an FFP without having to think about who is being left out: the Roma in Sweden and France, the Dalits in India, Indigenous and First Nations women in Canada — anyone who is being systematically held down, abused or exploited. The feminist principle of transparency would demand public reporting on resources and decisions by duty-bearers, providing stakeholders with the tools to question power, trace financial flows and question the criminalization or mistreatment of certain populations or the closing of civil society space. As a tool, this was, among other things, discussed as relevant to questions of habitat and natural resources, sex workers, state-sponsored (or ignored) violence

against women and gender-nonconforming people.

Ultimately, speakers were unconvinced that feminist foreign policy will immediately remedy the world's troubles, so much as provide a tool to challenge patriarchy, ecological emergency and militarism. Here, the example was given of FFP being put to good use when Sweden withdrew all aid during an Indian nuclear test. India, however, is not a donor-dependent country. So, this exercise of power did not yield the desired results, and organizations working on habitat protection and other issues that ran counter to the Indian Government suffered. Speakers acknowledged the need to explore in more detail the parameters through which conditionality might be productively or retrogressively exercised. Another example of FFP being put to good use was in attempts to expose memorandums of understanding (MOUs) between India and foreign companies about tribal land. In Australia, where FFP might be used to stop the country from proceeding with plans for its "climate bomb" Adani mine, to bring shifts in the trillions of dollars in subsidies for fossil fuels and the like.

VII. What to call it? When to invoke the "F-Word"?

Invoking the word "feminist" is a radical act, and the discussion interrogated how and when it might be appropriated by governments. On the one hand, it amps the level of expectation and ambition for foreign policy, if feminist literature stressing inclusion, human rights and intersectionality is to be the guidepost. On the other hand, for governments who adopt the term without meaningfully changing any practice, it's highly problematic. In this context, India was offered as an example of a government that likely thinks itself feminist because of its protective stance toward women, as opposed to a feminist civil society's understanding of the term as a full-throated affirmation of human rights.

Defining what we mean by feminist foreign policy would help to address this concern. There was some question among the speakers as to whether, in the current context of multiple and linked crises, a modern nation-state can ever truly be feminist. The speakers encouraged the group to ask deep questions and ensure that "the content and not just the container" was truly feminist. There was shared suspicion of the appropriation of the term by neoliberal institutions, and writings by feminist thinkers at

[DAWN](#) were recommended. Feminist foreign policy must contain a critical look at the nation-state, and within that, the forms of statehood and nationhood as with indigenous peoples.

Speakers called for feminist foreign policies that actively try to disrupt and move incredibly racist, hierarchical, patriarchal societies, and not merely to tweak around the edges. As one speaker put it: "These new phrases become too easy to integrate, and it makes me angry, that so many more women human rights defenders, indigenous peoples, landless, ethnic minorities and people in poverty are being driven out of their territories, while feminist foreign policy becomes this airy thing in rooms like this one."

Ultimately, speakers emphasized that in order to qualify on "content and not just container," feminist foreign policy must entail concrete measures to address the ecocidal, anthropocentric age we live in now and cannot be simply a re-branding of the status quo and traditional foreign policy approaches.

Thematic Discussions: Key Themes

Following presentations by the opening speakers, the group divided into three thematic areas to discuss the consultation's priority themes in greater detail. Each group was asked to highlight specific principles and possible accountability mechanisms in the course of their discussions.

Climate Change and FFP

This group asserted that FFP must have as a core principle a commitment to environmental integrity, ecosystem protection, and to those who live within those ecosystems. The group emphasized that FFP focus in this area should include not just climate, but also water, land and air. Combatting climate change is a feminist act, protecting future generations, lives and livelihoods. As such, it should be a key principle at the center of any feminist foreign policy.

With regard to structural changes, sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) were named as a deeply relevant component in a number of ways. First, there is the linking of violations of bodies and violations of territories – such as the violations of Indigenous feminist activists in Latin

America. FFP should connect colonialism, capitalism and misogyny. Second, without the realization of SRHR and access to family planning, the debate around consumption versus population continues. FFP must realize and protect sexual and reproductive health and rights and recognize the huge unmet need for family planning as a violation of women's rights. It must counter the dangerous and false narratives on population control for climate mitigation, understanding vast over consumption patterns as the driver of climate emissions, and that the realization of rights and bodily autonomy is central to ensuring resilient societies and a sustainable future.

For this group, a necessity for successful FFP is not only taking a gender-sensitive but a gender-transformative approach that addresses power and patriarchy. For example, as with disaster risk reduction (DRR), a feminist perspective is urgently needed. However, it gets overshadowed. DRR under FFP must explore the impacts on women and girls and connect these pieces before planning and implementing an approach. Mitigation practices were cited here as overly technical and insufficiently transformative. There is a need for a clear and rights-based approach in any FFP articulation.

Another key topic was coherence between domestic and foreign policy. Progressive foreign policies that promote environmental justice but ignore practices at home are disconnected and hollow. A number of groups are working to harness thinking around a feminist Green New Deal as an opportunity to shape policy and legislation in the U.S. and possibly serve as a model for all countries. In this context, it is essential to address consumption. Associated FFP efforts should be linked with initiatives to engage in domestic law and policy change aimed at reducing consumption, extractive practices and the like.

At this point in the discussion, care work emerged as an important topic, one that has an impact on the levels of carbon emission. The group encouraged a rethinking of the economic model valuing domestic and reproductive labor, not just pinning ideas of economic growth on models that are extractive in nature. Here, the High-Level Political Forum (HLPF) declaration was provided as an example: what are the most basic things we want to stop, how do we challenge economic growth as a benign paradigm. The group affirmed that this is

not to say there is not a role for the private sector, but it should be structured to take their impact into account rather than focus solely on incentivizing public-private partnerships.

Here the discussion held that “inclusive economic growth” does not answer all our questions about economic growth; the concept of “greening growth” concept, started by northern countries, similarly has not explored what that means in the context of gender. And at its core, it is not dealing adequately with question around consumption. The group held that certain patterns of consumption need to change if we are to achieve these goals.

The group was interested in the development of a process principle for FFP — one that not only centers gender climate process discussions but challenges the overwhelming dynamic casting of women as poor victims rather than stewards of environmental justice and change agents. It is vital to recognize the catastrophic impact that climate change has on women, and it will be essential to integrate impacted women's participation at relevant tables throughout the process.

The group discussed potential measures that could be used to hold governments to account in this regard, including:

- linking ambitious climate initiatives with FF, stipulating an accountability mechanism for FFP— one that discounts initiatives as feminist if they fail to address climate change. Specific indicators included:
 - committing to keeping warming under 1.5 degrees Celcius; and
 - committing to protecting oceans and water, including cross-border issues.
- clearly outlining ambition on investments, with indicators of FFP including mitigation and structuring climate finance in a gender-responsive way. Here, Canada was given as an example, given the fact that the country has included small but insufficient levels of adaptation in their climate finance, which is linked to their FIAP.
 - The group recommended FFPs clearly stipulate ambition in both directions. Targets should be set to hold FFPs accountable for both including gender in their climate financing and increasing their overall level of ambition for climate financing.

- Further, the group felt that FFP treatment of climate financing conversations needed to include a feminist cost analysis. The increasing amount of debt incurred by countries in the wake of the growing number of climate-related disasters must be taken into account. FFP should reverse the trend of countries not wanting to take on liability for loss and damage in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), ensuring that those structures do not further indebt those countries that are impacted by increasing disasters.

Financing FFP

The discussion in the financing group primarily examined two elements: 1) reforms to macroeconomic models that would advance the principles and impact of FFP, and 2) specific financing mechanisms that could be explored within foreign assistance.

I. Macroeconomic reforms to advance feminist foreign policy

On the macroeconomic side, the group questioned the reification of the market, underlying premises behind blended finance and concerns about the private sector encroaching on the role of the government and provision of public goods via elements such as public-private partnerships and “pink-washing” that happens in these circles. In line with the Sustainable Development Goal’s Agenda 2030, “leave no one behind” was suggested as a guiding principle for financing FFP, along with the [Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights](#), as part of the criteria for states with FFPs to utilize in engagements with the private sector (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2011).

Here trade was particularly examined as a pillar of foreign policy that would be essential to reimagine in order to advance a more feminist approach. Infusing trade agreements with human rights commitments was suggested, as was mandating that human rights and wellbeing have primacy over industry interests, as is in the example of making antiretrovirals affordable and accessible treatment options for people living with HIV. The group acknowledged that more work needs to be done to

think about how to make gender equality and women’s human rights part of a trade agreement-- for instance, how to ensure it was included throughout the whole agreement, including in the binding sections, as opposed to only in preambular text. Here the labor rights and climate justice movements were credited for successes shifting the trade debate, although it was noted that most labor and environmental provisions neglect a gender or feminist analysis. This was noted as an opportunity for FFP.

Treaty bodies, such as through CEDAW and other shadow reporting mechanisms (Convention Against Torture, Migrant Rights, the new Violence Instrument being promulgated through the ILO, etc.) were flagged as other opportunities to advance FFP. Supporting the submission of shadow reports and using opportunities to share shadow reports through UN fora were called out.

Tax evasion emerged as an issue of potential relevance to FFP, as well as making financial flows and disguised capital flight visible. Connecting to campaigns around democracy, tax fairness and government accountability to the people were all recommendations that emerged. Mobilizing feminist civil society to engage the Swiss Government was also raised.

Geneva emerged as a focus for Human Rights Council activities. Governments that care about their reputations might be pressured to make advances in ensuring human rights for all women. The UN also emerged as an actor that is ripe for reform and accountability to feminist principles.

II. Feminist practices for donors within FFP frameworks:

In this area, the group discussed how elements of FFP should be considered in the funding and delivery of foreign assistance programs. Here, feminist financing practices emerged as a key accountability mechanism for FFP, as well as a way to ensure coherence amongst the various levers of FFP. Specific recommendations included:

- meetings with feminist groups in countries where FFP donors are funding projects (local & national), as well as at the regional level, with the purpose of informing design and delivery of programs and ensuring accountability of funding flows;

- engaging in regular monitoring and publishing program and policy evaluations;
- making adherence to human rights standards a contingency for funding;
- increasing funding of feminist organizations and movements and investing in feminist organizing and local and national coalition-building; and
- interrogating the model of increasingly privatized aid (public-private partnerships, development- and social-impact bonds).

Global South Models for FFP

This group discussion focused on how we might imagine models for feminist foreign policy nations in the global south. The group welcomed this idea as a means of countering narratives of imperialism and neocolonialism by global north countries, the delivery of aid in a capitalist or export-promoting way (e.g., public-private partnerships, privatization of aid, arms trade, etc.). The concept of global south models of FFP was anchored in the principle of the universality of human rights and interlinkages with universal concerns like the climate crisis. It also appealed to the group as a counter to neofascist narratives, centering the leadership of progressive nations in the global south as a counterbalance to European, American and Australian shifts to the right. The uptake of FFP by states in the global south was also a valuable demonstration of transnational solidarity for feminist movements and an opportunity to support and affirm women’s human rights defenders.

Such issues as the refugee crisis, proxy wars (Chinese intervention in Africa, Saudi Arabia in Yemen), land grabbing/colonizing of the oceans and the proliferation of weaponized technology (AI, drones) and the U.S. posture of selectively enforcing treaties largely in the Middle East and North Africa all seemed ripe for critique through southern FFP.

Here as in other groups the tension between domestic and foreign policy was acute. The example of Ambassadors on Gender Equality having uniquely outward-looking mandates was critiqued when in many countries, such as Australia and the United States, there is a lack of adequate protections of the human rights, including violence against and land rights of, indigenous women and gender-non-conforming people. The enshrinement

of the rights of indigenous people was top-of-mind, and an issue that seemed appropriate for both foreign policy—as sovereign nations—as well as domestic.

In the context of the climate crisis, the extractive industry was particularly problematized, where it was understood that not only natural resources but also bodies are violated mostly with impunity. Trade was of particular concern among the foreign policy levers, with the example of Commonwealth trade deals in the Pacific being dependent on Brexit outcomes. The group wondered if FFP in southern states might be a means to confront and challenge state capture by multinational corporations, defending indigenous land rights and combatting corporate land grabs where governments were not adequately protecting communities. Here there were direct recommendations to align FFP conversations with those movements organizing for feminist trade including the ILO-targeted campaign the [Feminist Alliance for Rights](#), the [Beijing treaty on Corporations and Human Rights](#), the [Legally-binding instrument on transnational corporations and human rights](#) and the [Global Alliance for Tax Justice](#) (Feminist Alliance for Rights; United Nations Human Rights Council, 2019; International Alliance of Women, 2018; Global Alliance for Tax Justice). Illicit financial flows were of key concern, particularly in Canada, the U.K. and the U.S.

The group suggested the following indicators for the success of FFP:

- how we treat civil society at home, as well as how states defend civil society space at the global level;
- conservation of minerals and resources;
- intersectional application of feminism with cross-cutting issues like climate, indigenous rights and youth solidarity movements;
- anchoring FFP with corresponding commitments in domestic policy; and
- replicating FFP priorities at multilateral forums such as UN General Assembly and Security Council.

The group suggested the following accountability measures for FFP:

- strategic litigation on corporate land grabbing;
- community activism challenging SOAs;
- shadow reporting and calling out tit-for-tat “vote for me at UN” behavior, especially with regard to oil exports;

- using multilateral mechanisms to ensure FFP is honored (CEDAW reporting, etc.);
- publication of public accountability reports, using CSO-sourced indicators and reporting progress against named benchmarks for the desired changes and timeline; and
- publication of illicit financial flows.

Conclusion

The group agreed to publish a discussion summary timed with the UN General Assembly, UN Climate Action Summit and the launch of the Beijing+25 process, which marks the 25th anniversary of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. Additional countries are expected to commit to feminist foreign policies at that time.

In an effort to supply relevant recommendations to these audiences, which are sourced from the global feminist movements, this paper will be distributed publicly, alongside a number of related consultation summaries on themes relevant to advancing a global standard for feminist foreign policy. All will be made available at www.icrw.org and www.wedo.org, as well as on other publicly accessible platforms.

References

- DAWN. (n.d.). DAWN - Feminists Transforming a Fierce World. Retrieved from <https://dawnnet.org/>.
- Equality Fund. (2019, June 2). Innovative new Canadian initiative will mobilize unprecedented funds towards gender equality. Retrieved from <https://www.equalityfund.ca/news/partnership-for-gender-equality>.
- Feminist Alliance for Rights. (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://feministallianceforrights.org/>.
- Global Alliance for Tax Justice. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.globaltaxjustice.org/en>.
- Government of Canada. (2018). Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy. Retrieved from Government of Canada: http://international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_developpement-enjeux_developpement/priorities-priorites/policy-politique.aspx?lang=eng
- Government of Sweden. (2018, August 23). Handbook: Sweden's Feminist Foreign Policy. Retrieved September 19, 2019, from <https://www.government.se/reports/2018/08/handbook-sweden-s-feminist-foreign-policy/>.
- International Alliance of Women. (2018, October 16). FEMINISTS 4 BINDING TREATY. Retrieved from <https://womenalliance.org/feminists-4-binding-treaty>.
- Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2011). Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework. United Nations. Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesBusinessHR_EN.pdf.
- Oxfam Canada. (2019, June 4). Oxfam Canada welcomes Government of Canada's new \$700 million funding announcement on sexual and reproductive health and rights. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfam.ca/news/oxfam-canada-welcomes-government-of-canadas-new-700-million-funding-announcement-on-sexual-and-reproductive-health-and-rights/>.
- Ridge, A., Lambert, C., Crawford, J., Clement, R., Thompson, L., Gammage, S., & Goetz, A. M. (2019). Feminist Foreign Policy: Key Principles & Accountability Mechanisms.
- Sarosi, D. and Fernandes, S.L. (2019, May 9). Feminist aid: a call for G7 leaders to beat inequality. Oxfam Canada. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/feminist-aid-call-g7-leaders-beat-inequality>.
- Thompson, L., & Clement, R. (2019). Defining Feminist Foreign Policy. Washington, DC: International Center for Research on Women.
- United Nation Human Rights Council. (2019, July 16). Revised Draft - Legally Binding Instrument to Regulate, In International Human Rights Law, the Activities of Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises. Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/WGTranCorp/OEIGWG_RevisedDraft_LBI.pdf.



<https://www.icrw.org/>

&



<https://wedo.org/>