

Thank you, co-chair,

My name is Ulrike Roehr from LIFE, representing the Women and Gender constituency.

Over the past several years in the international climate change negotiations it has been established and agreed by Parties to the UNFCCC that gender equality and the participation of women are necessary for effective action on climate change mitigation and adaptation. In light of that recognition, gender equality and women's participation have been addressed in several thematic areas of the climate change negotiations. However, this has been done in an ad hoc manner, not always consistent with, nor comprehensive of the barriers for gender equality; therefore hindering the translation of gender sensitive language into actual implementation.

In the important debates here in the last days we recognised the results of these inconsistencies.

One of the main issues here is equity - and we support CAN's call for an equity review. However, in the debates the term equity was nearly exclusively used in terms of international equity. As Women and Gender groups, our main concerns are the disparities within countries, in other words, the social dimension including the gender dimension. These are hardly addressed in this process, except from civil society, but nonetheless relevant.

In order to properly include questions of intra-national equity - I would prefer to talk about justice -, it might be useful to have a closer look why they are relevant for the international process: Social and gender issues are impacting the UNFCCC process, for example by power relations, governance and public participation, acceptance of policies and so on, which influence national positions. And on the other hand, social and gender justice is impacted by the UNFCCC process, as policies have an influence on social issues, for example, mechanisms can increase or decrease social divide.

But the biggest unresolved question is: how to address these issues in a UN process? UN processes consider countries as black boxes, attributed with absolute emissions values, or with per capita values of emissions. At closer look, we can see that all these values differ substantially within countries. For instance, per capita emissions range from virtually zero to very high values - in any country. We can look at these domestic disparities, but what do we conclude for international commitments, policies, mechanisms in practical terms? This is something we need to go into in more depth.

Please be aware, we do not talk about women and men in terms of their physical bodies, but in terms of their social roles, norms and values attributed to these roles. This results in various disparities: income, assets, influence; within every societal group, determined by education, ethnicity, age and so on. Gender is cross-cutting through all these disparities and sections, leading to further differentiation, discrimination, and imbalance of power. So gender is fundamental within all these disparities and sections, in most cases adding to inequalities.

Therefore, gender balance is not sufficient to properly address gender issues. We need to talk about the substance and gender responsive policies.

We need to analyse gender differences, and, moreover and most important, look at the underlying causes of gender differences, such as power relations, dominance of male values and standards (androcentrism*), division of labour, care work. We have to look at the root causes of inequalities, and there are good reasons for the assumption that gender discrimination has the same root causes as environmental destruction and climate change.

As a consequence, when it comes to designing the 2015 agreement, we consider a systematic approach to gender and social inequality to be a central element and key aspect. From our experience we expect from such an approach innovative impulses which so far have not been recognised.

* Androcentrism means, that the dominating group in a society (currently this is undoubtedly the group of men, having the majority of decision-making positions and power) sets the values, norms and standards, which are seen as 'general' ones. Different values, needs etc. are seen as deviation from this 'general' norm, are therefore outside 'normality'.