

A New Deal for Women: \$\$\$ for global gender equality – how can Australians lead?

Jane Sloane, IWDA Executive Director
16 April 2008



Jointly presented by UNIFEM Australia and The Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Centre, UniSA

I'd like to thank Liz Ho for inviting me to speak here tonight and Ros Strong, President of UNIFEM Australia, for making this possible. I also want to thank the Minister for the Status of Women, Tania Plibersek, for giving me the opportunity to attend the 52nd Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women and Julia Burns, Executive Director of the Office For Women, for leading Australia's delegation, with the support of her staff.

A New Deal For Women

Almost six thousand people make the pilgrimage to New York each February in order to attend the UN Convention on the Status of Women (henceforth known as CSW), which provides an important opportunity to both measure progress in relation to gender equity as well as to deliberate and decide on policies that will make a difference looking ahead.

Despite being a first time participant, I was prepared for just about anything, including the New York winter. It was snowing when I arrived and it quickly turned into a blizzard that shut down transport systems and airports. Inside the United Nations the blizzard was in human form, a blitz of women pouring in from many countries, attracting comments from several UN Officials..."I've never seen so many women," one man said to his male colleague...'Yeah, thank god it's only for two weeks", the other replied.

And so I'll begin my presentation tonight with some reflections on CSW. I then want to use my experience there to reflect on a number of themes that are central to progressing gender equality in Australia to deliver a New Deal for Women. Listening to, and engaging with, global debates and discussions, and observing global leadership in action, inevitably prompted reflections on the potential for Australia to again play a role in promoting and modelling gender inclusive policies and practices at home as well as on the global stage. For we should remember that it's not so many years ago that Australia was regarded as a leader, nationally and internationally, for its gender-informed policy frameworks and budget processes.

Countries send official government delegations (consisting of government and NGO representatives) to the CSW each year to report to the United Nations on the status of women in their countries. Accredited NGOs also attend CSW to observe formal Commission sessions, monitor country speeches, present at workshops and lobby for specific language to be included in the outcomes document. This year over 4,500 women from accredited NGOs registered to attend CSW. Many more who have UN passes also attended, bringing NGO participants to over 5,000.

Forty-five countries currently have membership of CSW. Members are elected for a four-year term with member slots allocated to specific regions: African states, Asian states, Eastern European States, Latin and Caribbean states and 'Western European and Other' States. Australia, New Zealand and the USA are part of the last group, Western European and other States. Apart from two years between 1994 and 1996, the United States has had continuous membership of the Commission since 1947. Australia was last a member in 1996. So, apart from Australia and New Zealand, there has been no formal active representation of the Pacific region at CSW since it was established. Countries without membership can attend the Commission to report but have no voting rights and cannot directly influence the language in the outcomes document, which forms the framework for global policy on women's issues.

The lack of women within UN decision-making structures was very apparent, especially in the structures to which CSW reports, which are heavily male in composition. Even the Chair of the CSW Committee is male. In terms of the broader UN structures, we heard that gender balance is unlikely to be achieved until 2120 at the current rate of progress. The Special Adviser on the Advancement of Women to the UN Secretary General said at the NGO day, which preceded the official opening of CSW, that her office, and that of other women's divisions within the UN, were operating on shoestring budgets and needed more people and resources to deliver the programs – this says something about the capacity of these positions and divisions to drive a change agenda. I want to come back to this issue later when I reflect on what kind of architecture might best help us progress gender equality nationally and internationally.

The limited number of voices from our region was very apparent. There was a total absence of Indigenous Australian women and very few women from (South) Pacific countries. Their voices were not often heard in the ten days that I was present. Most sessions combined a focus on Asia and the Pacific, and Asian voices dominated at these sessions. This was most obvious in the NGO daily briefing, where both the co-convenors of the Asia-Pacific caucus are currently from South Asia.

Enabling Indigenous and Pacific NGO women to participate meaningfully in the CSW discussions and supporting participation of Indigenous and Pacific women in UN fora is critical from a representational perspective. It is also important because global engagement can help advance the situation of Indigenous and Pacific women, including in relation to participation in decision making. In most Pacific countries less than one percent of parliamentary representatives are women even though women comprise well over 50 percent of the population. In Australia, it was not until 2001 that we saw the first Indigenous woman, Carol Martin MLA (WA), elected to an Australian parliament. In the words of another Indigenous woman politician, the Hon Marion Scrymgour MLA, now Deputy Chief Minister of the Northern Territory, getting more Indigenous women into our parliaments won't 'solve the issues of economic development, community safety and human rights overnight but we can form strong political networks to make things happen.'¹

Diversity of voice matters. We know that other forms of discrimination interact with gender to bridge the divide for all women. The life expectancy of non-Aboriginal women in Australia, for example is some 88 years, compared with 66 for Aboriginal women. Incorporating the diversity of women's experience in social, political and

¹ 'Indigenous Women Form Political Alliance', *Media Release*, Emily's List Australia, 2 September 2003

economic life, and in public policy, is important on representational and rights grounds, and it's essential if we are to bridge the divide for Indigenous women.

To do this, we need leadership and accountability. On both counts I'm hopeful, given the actions of the Rudd Government to date. However I know, too, that evidence points to the scale of this challenge. To quote the UN Millennium Project Taskforce on gender equality, 'Because gender inequality is deeply rooted in entrenched attitudes, societal institutions, and market forces, political commitment at the highest international and national levels is essential to institute the policies that can trigger social change and to allocate the resources necessary to achieve gender equality.'²

No country has yet achieved gender equality, and examples of policy evaporation – the loss of resources and momentum between commitment and action – are legion. Which leads me to another theme I want to take up tonight – the need for civil engagement and action to help create and hold the space for national and international leadership. We have already witnessed, many times, the power of people and communities in responding to issues individually and collectively. The early advocacy by Australians for women to be able to vote, the 1967 Referendum which overwhelmingly delivered (belatedly, shamefully) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people the right to be counted in the national census and to give the Commonwealth Government power to make specific laws in respect of Indigenous people, the agitation of Australians for asylum seekers to receive humane treatment, the involvement of people and communities worldwide in the Make Poverty History campaign, the response of Australians to victims of the tsunami, to Australian farmers facing such enormous losses during the sustained drought, the demands by many Australian for action on climate change... Government action so often follows public advocacy.

And so here we have the opportunity to individually and collectively encourage the Australian Government to again play a leadership role with respect to gender equality. It's an opportunity to get our own backyard in order while simultaneously encouraging a leadership role internationally. In fact, it would be hard for Australia to legitimately do the latter without being active nationally. Australia used to be a leader in terms of structures and programs to promote gender equality but we seem to have gone backwards, or at least stagnated, in recent years.

New Deal Issues

So, what are some of the issues that demand a New Deal for Women? I'll turn first to areas where I think leadership is needed in Australia and then reflect on key regional and international priorities.

- We have no **universal provisions for paid parental leave**. Only 30-40 percent of women, mostly public servants and white-collar workers, receive some paid leave after the birth of a child. Casual employees are particularly disadvantaged in this regard. Australia and the US remain the only two developed countries without a universal paid maternity leave regime. Some European countries offer close to a year of paid parental leave to be shared between the parents. In Britain up to 39 weeks of paid maternity or paternity leave is provided. The International Labour Organisation standard is at least 14 weeks paid leave. The availability of adequate

² UN Millennium Project 2005. *Taking Action: Achieving Gender Equality and Empowering Women*. Task Force on Education and Gender Equality, P.2

paid maternity leave is, to quote Hutch Hussein, National Co-Covenor of *Emily's List*, 'integral to women's equality in the workplace and society.'³

In *The Age* this week we have seen an exchange of views about who should pay for maternity leave⁴. Jessica Brown from the Centre for Independent Studies raised an important point about acting in a way that does not undermine the contribution employers currently make to overall maternity leave coverage. While maternity leave is inadequate, it is not absent. Overall efficiency will be enhanced if those employers who see it as in their interests to provide maternity leave continue to do so. This is not a greenfields policy site, and I hope the Productivity Commission Inquiry will provide some smart policy recommendations and good modeling about how best to proceed. But those of us concerned with gender equity should focus less on the relatively small proportion of women who have access to paid maternity leave, and more on the very many who don't – many of whom are also least able to bear the costs individually.

This is an entirely appropriate area for government action; taxes allow the costs of something from which we all benefit – production of future generations – to be shared across the community, rather than born primarily by individuals. Treasurer Wayne Swan said recently that 'Australian women are deserving of support but we will also only do what is affordable and responsible in the long term'.⁵ I look forward to the report from the Productivity Commission confirming that maternity leave is both affordable and responsible in the long term - because this is certainly the story internationally.

- **Pay equity:** On average women receive 16% less income for doing the same kind of work as men. In Australia the reasons for this are primarily structural and social and require a careful policy response. Among younger men and women with similar employment histories, there's effectively no wage gap. 'It is among older cohorts, when the careers of men begin to take off and women's career interruptions begin to affect pay structures, that large pay gaps emerge.'⁶ Gaps are also more common among skilled, educated workers where experience matters more. And it is perfectly reasonable to pay more for experience. But the 'back story' is more complex. The *benefits* of the mix of productive and reproductive work that characterises the lives of many women – and which women consistently tell us they value - are shared between the individual and society. The *costs*, however, tend to be born predominantly by individual women in the form of significant pay differentials, lower life-time earnings and thus lower superannuation for retirement.

We all benefit from women's reproductive and caring work, and from the flexibility offered by part-time work to enable families to manage paid work and caring roles. As with parental leave, we need a new approach to social policy that better

³ 'Publicly funded paid maternity leave would benefit women and business', *Media Release*, Emily's List Australia, 5 February 2008

⁴ Jessica Brown, 'Baby bid turns taxpayers into foster parents', *The Age*, April 14, 2008; Larissa Dubecki, 'Maternity leave: the moral option', *The Age*, 15 April 2008

⁵ *The Sunday Age*, 30 March, p. 5

⁶ Mark Wooden, 'Governments can't close gender pay gap', *The Australian*, 7 March, 2008, <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23331666-7583,00.html>

supports the combinations of roles and responsibilities undertaken by women, and values and makes visible their reproductive and caring roles.

- **Representation:** The federal government's announcement of nine men and one woman to head its 2020 Future Summit - and the response to it – has probably done more to elevate this issue than a hundred speeches or press releases! The Summit is an opportunity to underpin the point that Australian thinking, culture and values are the domain of all Australians. As Claire Braund, Executive Director of *Women on Boards*, put it, how can a group dominated overwhelmingly by middle aged, white Anglo Saxon men 'have the insights necessary to address the major issues of our time – including the critical areas of education, health and family in which women play key roles. As Einstein famously said – you can't solve the problem with the same thinking that created it.'⁷

I'm sure the public reaction will have sensitised the government on this issue. The fact that this issue arose at all in the early days of a progressive government with the largest ever number of women in senior ministerial positions suggests that gender thinking is not routine, and that gender-blind decision making brings significant risks.

While the numbers of women occupying senior decision making positions has increased within both the government and private sectors over the last decade, the figures are still woeful. Only about one third of positions on Australian Government boards and bodies are held by women.⁸ The situation in private sector management and on private sector boards is significantly worse. *Women on Board's* latest research into the board composition of the top 200 Australian and New Zealand companies was just eight per cent in December 2007. Half of the top 200 publicly listed Australian companies still do not have even one female director.⁹

In the face of abundant research about the value of diversity and the particular strengths women bring to decision making, this issue seems like a no-brainer. But the fact that women's representation on company boards is still in single figures underlines the need for national leadership, and development of new contemporary performance framework that reflects minimum gender standards. There are various ways one might do this without adding to the regulatory load on business. ASX Corporate Governance Principle 2, for example, is structure the board to add value. When women are 50% or more of customers, an increasing number of shareholders are women and the tight labour market makes retention of skilled women so critical, it is not difficult to mount a case that increasing women on boards beyond 8% is 'structuring to add value'.

Nominations committees might need to look beyond the pool of former CEOs and profit centre managers in appointing women directors. Indeed, this is part of the point. This is not the only relevant experience needed on a board. Women are well

⁷ *Women on Boards*, 'Australia's 1001 Summit Steering Committee', MEDIA RELEASE, 6 February 2008

⁸ Australian Government, Office for Women,
http://www.familyassist.gov.au/ofw/leadership_development/national_leadership_initiative/women_on_boards/index.htm

⁹ *Women on Boards*, 'Fewer women does not bode well for Australian business', MEDIA RELEASE, 4 February 2008

represented in other areas of business that go directly to the capacity to reach and connect with markets and customers in an efficient and effective way.

Government could play a leadership role here too, without adding to the regulatory load on business. For example, most government departments and agencies have panels of preferred suppliers to assist procurement. The federal government could simply decide that companies that can demonstrate that diversity is substantively addressed in their governance structures will be get extra points in determining companies to be listed as preferred suppliers.

- **Inequities in Indigenous communities:** Girls and women in indigenous communities experience a disproportionately high degree of domestic violence, lack of education, lack of health care and lack of job prospects, all of which require strategies to address the structural causes of this economic, social and spiritual poverty and insecurity. We need to respond with initiatives that are gender informed and gender specific so that they don't reproduce or exacerbate existing inequalities. Decision makers need a capacity to see public policy through the eyes of women.

Beyond Australia

Looking beyond Australia, the need for a New Deal for women is even more pressing, as IWDA and its partner organisations see first hand in our work.

- **Violence against women** is still 'a major cause of death and disability for women of reproductive age, ranking alongside cancer, and a greater cause of ill-health than traffic accidents and malaria combined.'¹⁰ It's estimated that worldwide, one in five women becomes a victim of rape or attempted rape in her lifetime.¹¹ This situation provides compelling reasons why our efforts to address gender inequality should always start with the interests of women. Because gender inequality has a women's face, and women bear very real, direct, personal, daily costs.
- **HIV/AIDS** is another area that highlights the close link between gender equality, development and security. Almost half the HIV-positive people in the world are now women, and for many of these, transmission happens despite marriage and monogamy. In Africa, where the epidemic has stretched the furthest, young women are now three times more likely to be HIV-positive than young men. Gender inequality is at the heart of the global HIV/AIDS challenge. As the heads of UNAID, UNIFEM and UNFPA put it,

'Would the world have a serious AIDS epidemic today if gender inequalities were less pronounced? If more women had greater control of matters related to their reproductive and sexual health? If they enjoyed greater access to economic opportunities and resources so that they would not need to resort to exploitative occupations? If more men were willing to assume responsibility for

¹⁰ Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe 2002, Recommendation 1582 (2002) on Domestic Violence against Women.

¹¹ García-Moreno et al. (2005). WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women. Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses, Geneva: WHO, p.74

preventing HIV transmission and for caring for family members who are HIV-positive?¹²

This is an important issue in our region. The scale of the HIV/AIDS challenge in Papua New Guinea owes much to the inequality of women and the endemic violence they experience. Next year's session of the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) will focus on the role of women and men working as carers, in the context of HIV/AIDS. It's a compelling theme and one that invites and invokes public engagement. Men need to be involved in helping to address the inequities faced by women and girls so that all families and communities can benefit.

- **Accelerated Action on Global Commitments:** The **Millennium Development Goals** provide a powerful, globally agreed framework for focussing our efforts and resources strategically. Our concern must go beyond the specific Goal 3 on gender equality and the empowerment of women since the success of this goal as 'the achievement of Goal 3 depends on the extent to which each of the other goals addresses gender-based constraints and issues.'¹³

To ensure that Goal 3 is met by 2015, the UN Millennium Project Task Force has identified seven strategic and interdependent priorities as 'the minimum necessary to empower women and alter the historical legacy of female disadvantage:

1. Strengthen opportunities for post-primary education for girls while simultaneously meeting commitments to universal primary education.
2. Guarantee sexual and reproductive health and rights.
3. Invest in infrastructure to reduce women's and girls' time burdens.
4. Guarantee women's and girls' property and inheritance rights.
5. Eliminate gender inequality in employment by decreasing women's reliance on informal employment, closing gender gaps in earnings, and reducing occupational segregation.
6. Increase women's share of seats in national parliaments and local governmental bodies.
7. Combat violence against girls and women.¹⁴

These priorities can also be translated to Indigenous Australia, where the situation for women in parts of our nation parallels that of women in many developing countries. Evidence shows that investing in gender equity consistently pays off in terms of higher economic growth, better mother and child survival and better health outcomes where 'education for all' is genuinely embraced. The Rudd Government's interest in evidence-based policy is welcome – we need to invest in what we know works, and the evidence for gender-informed policy and programs is clear.

The Prime Minister is seeking a bigger role in global affairs – launching a push to secure Australia a seat on the UN Security Council. I hope this interest is also reflected in greater attention to the gender issues which are at the heart of contemporary security and insecurity. As Mary Robinson said recently, "we deal with

¹² Dr Peter Piot, Ms Noeleen Heyzer, Dr Nafis Sadik, 'Forward', *Gender, HIV and Human Rights: A Training Manual*, UNIFEM, 2000

¹³ UN Millennium Project 2005. *Taking Action: Achieving Gender Equality and Empowering Women*. Task Force on Education and Gender Equality, p.2.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, P.3

health and education and empower women and girls but we are not crunching on the key issue". This fundamental issue is security...in terms of security from poverty, climate change, abuse and discrimination. "The passion, strength and power of women to make change at grassroots level is always underestimated", she says. "It was underestimated when I was President of Ireland. It's been underestimated all the time."¹⁵ UN Security Council Resolution 1325, the historic resolution that highlights the importance of women's role in peace building, peace keeping, security, and conflict resolution at all levels, seeks a more participatory role for women and provides a framework for action.

New Deal mechanisms

So, what mechanisms are needed to deliver a New Deal for women and how could we get there?

We need to draw on Australia's previous experience in this area, as well as more recent developments in thinking about our national gender architecture. I noticed that the latest edition of *Ms* magazine gives credit to Australia for leading the way with gender informed budgeting, providing a model for other countries to adopt. The *Women's Budget Statement* had an educative role in line departments and the document provided an important resource for civil society. But the arrangement was limited in its reach beyond gender focal points and became something of a tick the box mechanism. We need to remember this experience when designing new policy architecture. We need something that works at an outcomes level and minimises the 'groan' factor by integrating with existing requirements.

At IWDA we've been consulting with researchers to explore options for reinstating gender in mainstream government policy frameworks. Anna George, Adjunct Professor, School of Social Sciences and Humanities at Murdoch University, has proposed the following approach as a way of embedding gender in the work of government that maximises efficiency while minimising additional bureaucratic weight and complexity:

- 1) **Integrate gender into the existing mainstream budget framework.** Simply put, the performance-based budget framework introduced in 1999 involves managing the budget through an 'outcomes and outputs' framework to improve decision-making and performance. But it was introduced at the same time the gender budget process was on its way out. So the potential to use the framework to systematically assess and report on outcomes on gender equality across all agencies has never been fully explored.

A high-level inter-departmental committee involving the Departments of Prime Minister and Cabinet, Finance, the Australian National Audit Office and key expenditure departments such as the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs should be convened to determine how best to use existing performance budgeting framework to ensure accountability on gender policy commitments. There were some great examples given at CSW by other governments (Canada, New Zealand, Belgium and Kurdistan) of embedding gender

¹⁵ The Guardian Weekly, 28 March 2008, p.13

budgeting and financing initiatives and holding each agency to account on quality and impact of programs, rather than just the number of programs implemented.

Gender budgeting is premised on the idea that national budgets should not only be analysed for the impact they have on certain groups, such as the poor, they should also be analysed for gender fairness. The rationale has both equity and efficiency dimensions. Many men and women play different productive and reproductive roles at various lifestages, and policy and programs need to reflect these differences. For example, we know that the overwhelming majority of single parents are women, so unemployment programs that disadvantage single parents compared with unemployed people without children or living in a two-parent family will disproportionately affect women. As will work tests for social security payments that penalise single parents who work more hours during school terms and then take time to be with their children during school holidays rather than put them in care.

- 2) **Complement the budget process with development of a random audit/compliance mechanism** that minimises red-tape but provides clear incentives for performance against gender policy objectives – such as a doubling of the annual efficiency dividend required of each department.
- 3) **Establish a high-level Gender Equality Unit** within Prime Minister and Cabinet to provide policy leadership (including on 1 and 2 above) and a whole-of-government perspective. It could second senior bureaucrats from other departments for short periods to assist in establishing priorities and policy directions, which would then be taken forward by relevant departments and agencies. This should include working systematically to broaden the 'gender' agenda so gender becomes a routine part of policy development, as well as focusing on areas of particular importance to women, such as recognising, remunerating and making visible women's contribution to the economy through their reproductive work and other unpaid caring roles, their work in the informal sector, and their contribution to social capital.

The policy unit could also develop ongoing ways to bring together senior bureaucrats, academics and representatives from civil society to identify, shape and monitor policy priorities in key areas such as parental leave; social policy arrangements that provide greater flexibility and support and assist families to make smoother transitions between paid and 'unpaid' work over their lifecourse; or ways of seriously tackling the problem of violence against women and the ingrained gender discrimination women continue to experience when they seek legal redress.

Mainstreaming gender does not replace the need for targeted, women-focused policies and programs. A new deal for women will require both. In the absence of specific government machinery, consideration of gender needs and gaps risk being arbitrary or overlooked. Expenditure priorities matter. Women, especially poor and low-income women, stand to benefit most from investments in community infrastructure and from social payments. All programs and policies should be considered for their potential to address current imbalances and inequities.

International gender architecture

There was a strong focus on the United Nations' own gender architecture at this year's CSW. However, it seems to me that the reforms to combine and strengthen the women's divisions within the UN will only address part of the problem. **Without an accountability framework**, structural reform alone is unlikely to deliver the changes required. Without key performance indicators for each UN division in terms of minimum standards for gender representation and resourcing, and consequences linked to performance, I think we're unlikely to see change. The possibility of gaining or losing, say, two per cent of a unit budget might be one way of focusing efforts. As Indigenous Education Leadership Institute director Chris Sara underlined when welcoming Prime Minister Rudd's recent commitment to an annual report to parliament on closing the gap in Indigenous life expectancy, 'if it gets measured, it gets done.'

Australia could play a constructive role in promoting change, but it will require the Government to again become **an active and informed player in the CSW processes**, given the recent history of multilateral quietude. A strengthened profile and credibility can then provide a base for seeking membership of the Commission. Having the Minister for the Status of Women attend at least part of CSW to advocate for and promote issues on which Australia is an active and concerned player would be a concrete indication of Australia's renewed commitment to the advancement of women and engagement with multilateral processes more generally.

We should also look to strengthen the connections between gender discussions at the national and international level. As an initial step, I would encourage the Government to strengthen the current system of National Women's Secretariats within Australia and their links to international processes by supporting an enhanced capacity to reach out to their constituents on international issues and to seek the views of women and organisations to input to national statements and priorities to be pursued in international fora.

And so, **in conclusion...**

At a time of skill shortages and when the challenges ahead for our global community are significant, we need to be able to access all of the skills and diversity in our community. Women's contributions, whether through seats at the conference table, the board table, at the kitchen table, in parliament, or at the Prime Minister's 2020 Summit, are important – for their own sake, and because women's contribution to the economy and to family and community life are vital to our social fabric. When women's voices are absent, silenced or marginalised what is lost is a richness that impoverishes us culturally, socially and spiritually. It also has a high economic cost. The 2007 Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific, for example, estimates the region loses up to US\$47 billion a year because of restrictions on women's access to employment, and up to US\$30 billion a year because of gender gaps in education.

Such outcomes are rarely the intentional, understood consequences of conscious choices. They are generally the cumulative affect of gender blindness - of not seeing that a policy or program might affect women and men differently - of structural barriers resulting from ways of organising and thinking about our work and family lives that reflect very different realities from those of today.

If we are to create a world in which all people can live with dignity and respect and have the ability to realise their potential, those who are marginalised and without a voice need to be empowered and included.

'Gender inequality is a problem that has a solution.'¹⁶ But the solution has remained elusive for the want of leadership and resourcing. The proposals I have put forward tonight are grounded in evidence of what works. They are strategic and they are affordable. The costs of not acting are most certainly greater.

We need a new deal for women **and** men so we can, together, build ways of working and living that accommodate the experiences, needs and priorities of both, so we can benefit from all of our talent and knowledge. As Arundhati Roy so poetically prophesised 'a new world is possible, and on a quiet day I can even hear her breathing'.

Thank you.

* my grateful thanks to Jo Crawford, Senior Adviser, IWDA for her significant contribution to this speech and to Carole Shaw, Senior Program Manager, IWDA for her input, especially in relation to CSW.

¹⁶ UN Millennium Project 2005. *Taking Action: Achieving Gender Equality and Empowering Women*. Task Force on Education and Gender Equality, p.27