Addressing Sexual and Gender Diversity in Dutch development cooperation

A report of the Mapping by Share-Net Netherlands on addressing Sexual and Gender Diversity by Dutch NGOs, universities and Dutch Ministries in development cooperation

On behalf of Share-Net Netherlands

Marloes Huiskes, Rutgers, the Netherlands

Jo Reinders, SRHR consultant, Right2Be, the Netherlands

Utrecht, the Netherlands, March 2018

Table of content

Acronyms

AIDS: Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome

Amref Flying Doctors: African Medical and Research Foundation Flying Doctors

CEDAW: Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women

CSW: Commission on the Status of Women

DSO: Department of Social Development

EU: European Union

FHC: Female Health Company

GGD Amsterdam: Public Health Service of Amsterdam

GNP+: Global Network of People living with HIV

GSA: Gay-Straight Alliances

GUSO: Get Up Speak Out

HIV: Human Immunodeficiency Virus

ICCO: Interchurch Organization for Development Co-operation

IDAHO: International Day Against Homophobia

ISS/EUR: International Institute of Social Studies/ Erasmus University Rotterdam

KIT: Royal Tropical institute

LGBTI: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexuals, Transgender, Intersex

LGBTIQ: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexuals, Transgender, Intersex, Queer

MoECS: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science

MoFA: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

MSM: Men who have Sex with Men

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NGO: Non-Governmental Organization

OECD: Organization for economic cooperation and development

PSI Europe: Population Services International Europe

Radboud GDS: Radboud Gender & Diversity Studies

RHRN: Right Here Right Now

RNW Media: Radio Netherlands Worldwide Media

SGD: Sexual and Gender Diversity

SDGs: Sustainable Development Goals

SOGI: Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

SOGIESC: sexual orientations, gender identities, gender expressions and sex characteristics

SRH: Sexual and Reproductive Health

SRHR: Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund

WASH: Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

WSW: Women who have Sex with Women

Introduction

This report presents the mapping of Share-Net Netherlands on which NGOs, Universities and Dutch ministries address Sexual and Gender Diversity (SGD) and in what way. Important in the mapping was also to find out which strategies are used to address SGD. Unfortunately, the information obtained through various methods did not allow for the development of a clear and complete picture on who is doing what exactly, as well as clarify and classify the strategies used to address SGD. Where possible efforts have been made to shed light on the main concepts underlying these strategies.

Share-Net Netherlands is the Dutch Knowledge Platform on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR), aiming to contribute to the international SRHR agenda. The Platform focuses on knowledge generation, dissemination and translation, as well as the promotion of knowledge use. It combines the expertise and strengths of Dutch organisations, Southern partners, and key international actors working in the area of SRHR, to achieve the SRHR and HIV-related Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

For many years Sexual and Gender Diversity (SGD) has been a focal point within Dutch development cooperation and the Dutch development policy[1]. SGD is addressed both within policies on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) and specifically as human rights for LGBTI within the Dutch development policy on Human Rights.

Currently, Share-Net Netherlands has chosen Sexual Diversity as one of eight focus themes to give attention to. At the end of 2015, a Working Group 'Sexual Diversity' with Share-Net members was set up with the aim to develop a work plan for the theme, to plan and manage activities and outcomes related to addressing and mainstreaming sexual and gender diversity in Dutch development cooperation and to positively influence Dutch development cooperation policy making regarding this issue.

---

[1] NCDO (March 4th, 2013). *The Dutch and development cooperation. Ahead of the crowd or trailing behind?* See: http://www.ncdo.nl/sites/default/files/Report%20Analysis%20The%20Dutch%20and%20Development%20Cooperation%20FINAL%202013%2003%2004.pdf

Sexual and gender diversity is the term used in this report to refer to all the diversities of sexual orientations, gender identities, gender expressions and sex characteristics - also abbreviated as **SOGIESC**-, without the need to specify each of the identities, behaviours or characteristics that form this plurality[2].

To address the people concerned within sexual and gender diversity, this report uses the abbreviation **LGBTI**, meaning lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people. In literature on sexual and gender diversity and in specific practices often the more complete abbreviation LGBTIQ is used, covering queer or questioning people as well.

SRHR programmes and **mainstreaming** programmes that aim to address SGD within SRHR policies and programmes in order to make them more **inclusive**, are often limited to meeting the needs of only LGBT as a first step in gaining acceptance of the broader concept of sexual and gender diversity. This limitation is mostly due to the complexity and general unawareness of what sexual and gender diversity includes as well as the inability in meeting the different and specific needs of all the target groups within sexual and gender diversity. Furthermore, it is also often due to not being able to reach out to intersex and queer people, who usually do not identify themselves publicly and also may not even identify themselves within the LGBTI scene.

In addition to LGBTI, HIV programmes often include people who practice homosexual behaviour but do not want to identify with one of these abbreviated identities, mainly due to stigmatisation. To categorise males who engage in sexual activities with other males, regardless of how they identify themselves, the overarching terminology used is **Men who have Sex with men** (MSM). In line with this terminology, **Women who have Sex with Women** (WSW) is used to categorise females who engage in sexual activity with other females, regardless of how they identify themselves.

Mainstreaming SGD in this report means the integration of a sexual and gender diversity perspective into the preparation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of (internal and external) SRHR policies, regulatory measures, advocacy and programmes, with a view to promoting equality for LGBTI, and combating the discrimination of them. **Internal mainstreaming** refers to mainstreaming of sexual and gender diversity in the organisations' policies including their human resource policies, and staffs' acceptation and preferably celebration of SGD in terms of adequate knowledge, attitudes and practises. **External mainstreaming** refers to mainstreaming SGD in advocacy and programmes in order to meet the needs and rights of LGBTI people.

Furthermore, instead of using **gay rights,** the report mentions **human rights for LGBTI,** which is a more inclusive and politically correct terminology.

---

[2] A glossary related to sexual and gender diversity can be found at
http://itspronouncedmetrosexual.com/2013/01/a-comprehensive-list-of-lgbtq-term-definitions/ and at:
http://www.glaad.org/document.doc?id=99

A first SGD activity of Share-Net Netherlands and its Working Group was the organisation of a successful thematic meeting on Sexual Diversity, which took place in Amsterdam on January 14 2016. After this meeting, it was decided to conduct a mapping in the Netherlands on who is doing what and how around SGD in development cooperation, using an online survey and interviews, which resulted in this report.

After the publication of this report, the intention is to discuss the results of this mapping exercise during an expert meeting with selected Share-Net members and SRHR & LGBTI experts in 2018. This intended meeting will aim to discuss these results in combination with the results of a desk research on effective strategies to address and mainstream SGD, also initiated by Share-Net Netherlands and simultaneously conducted with this mapping. This desk research report did not only look at existing evidence about effective strategies, but also under which conditions they work well.

Finally, the outcomes of this intended expert meeting including the reports on the mapping and the desk research might then be used for a round table discussion with policy makers of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. The aim will be to influence and where possible help improve the Dutch development cooperation policies on sexual and gender diversity.

Last but not least, Share-Net Netherlands, the Working Group 'Sexual Diversity' and the authors of this report like to thank all respondents – representatives of the Dutch NGOs, universities and the two Dutch ministries, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, - for their time and input.

1. Research questions and methodology

In 2016, a mapping through an online survey among Dutch NGOs and universities was initiated by Share-Net Netherlands by ISS-graduated student Victoria Meza Servín and student Francis Akali. As both left the Netherlands and this project, the mapping was finalised by Marloes Huiskes from Rutgers and Jo Reinders from Right2Be.

The mapping intended to generate answers regarding the status of the Share-Net Netherlands network and non-member NGOs, universities and ministries active in development cooperation, on the specific topic of sexual and gender diversity (SGD). The aim was to provide an insight into the type of projects, programmes, research, and other activities regarding SGD in which Dutch NGOs and universities are involved. A further aim was to gain an insight into knowledge on advocacy for SGD and Human Rights for LGBTI and what and how Dutch development cooperation policies address SGD. Finally, the mapping also aimed to find out which strategies are used to address SGD in advocacy and programmes.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science were not part of the online survey. Instead, representatives were interviewed, of which the results are described and discussed in Chapter 4.

In total 25 online responses were collected via this SurveyMonkey research. 5 of the 25 responses came from universities. Also, 6 interviews were carried out with representatives of the responding Dutch NGOs.

In mid-2017, a first attempt was made to analyse the SurveyMonkey responses as input for the report. However, the outcomes were incomplete and discrepancies were noticed. Together with Share-Net Netherlands it was decided to create an overview with all answers in one sheet and to send it to all relevant organisations again. It was hoped that previously given answers would be adapted and completed and possibly new respondents would be involved. However, no new responses were received and after a second call for adaptations and completion, only a few respondents answered the call. Finally, in response to the request of Share-Net Netherlands to get permission for publication of the mapping report, more responses were received and preliminary results could be adapted and reported in a more complete way.

To understand the results and conclusions and recommendations well, it should be noted that:

- The study is not comprehensive as only a limited group of NGOs and universities have sent a response.
- Most of the respondents answering the survey have been working with their employers for a reasonable time and it is therefore assumed that they are in a good position to answer the questions accurately.
- The survey had different questions for NGOs and universities.
- When needed, answers were checked and completed with information on websites of the organisations of the respondents.
- The survey mainly focused on activities related to MSM and LGB people, while gender diversity and intersex proved not to be issues explicitly dealt with by almost all respondents.

This report has been produced with the above limitations in mind.

3a. Results of the Mapping of Dutch NGOs and universities

As described in the methodology section, to know more about what regarding the issue of SGD is addressed within Dutch NGOs and universities and how it is addressed, a SurveyMonkey questionnaire was prepared in consultation with the Working Group on Sexual Diversity of Share-Net Netherlands. This questionnaire was sent to relevant NGOs and universities which are known as being active in SRHR in developing countries. When needed, answers were checked and completed with information on the websites of the respondents.

The respondents of this questionnaire represented the following organisations: Rutgers, RNW Media, AFEW International, Dance4Life, Prisma, ICCO & Kerk in Actie, GGD Amsterdam, Hivos, Oxfam Novib, KIT, CHOICE for Youth and Sexuality, Female Health Company, Aidsfonds, ResultsinHealth, Simavi, Cordaid, GNP+, Amref Flying Doctors, COC Netherlands and PSI Europe.

The universities involved were Maastricht University, University of Amsterdam, Radboud University Medical Center, Radboud University, and ISS/EUR.

3a.1 NGOs

General findings
- Of the 20 organisations responding, 13 have SGD included in their mission.
- 7 (Rutgers, GGD Amsterdam, Hivos, Oxfam Novib, GNP+, Amref Flying Doctors, COC Netherlands) out of 20 organisations stated there was a policy in place on SGD.
- According to the survey, 8 (Rutgers, CHOICE, GGD Amsterdam, Hivos, Oxfam Novib, GNP+, Amref Flying Doctors, COC Netherlands) out of 20 organisations actively and publicly promote their involvement in LGBTI issues.
- Advocacy programmes on LGBTI programmes are being implemented by 8 (Rutgers, CHOICE, GGD Amsterdam, Hivos, Oxfam Novib, GNP+, Amref Flying Doctors, COC Netherlands) out of 20 organisations.
- 10 out of 20 organisations state that values and attitudes towards SGD play an important role when negotiating partnerships with others in the South.
- Of all the organisations, 7 (Rutgers, AFEW, GGD Amsterdam, Hivos, KIT, ResultsinHealth, COC Netherlands) out of 20 do implement research on LGBTI issues.

- According to the survey, 8 (Rutgers, RNW Media, Prisma, GGD Amsterdam, Hivos, Oxfam Novib, CHOICE, COC Netherlands) out of 20 organisations allocated funds for LGBTI-related programmes.

Furthermore, the following is worth mentioning;
- 4 (Rutgers, CHOICE, Oxfam Novib, Simavi) out of 20 organisations have focal points for LGBTI.
- 11 out of 20 organisations engaged their staff and/or beneficiaries in training or sensitisation which included LGBTI issues. But also 11 out of 20 organisations do not have resources at hand, such as training materials on LGBTI sensitisation.
- The question on having a fixed budget amount to invest in LGBTI is debatable since there are only a few organisations working with fixed amounts, unless they are a 'one theme' organisation.

Overall, most respondents working at the organisations said that they feel very comfortable handling LGBTI issues and needs, but when faced with threats, none of the organisations have a specific security policy in place which can guide them in difficult situations with which local LGBTI people and organisations can be confronted. Cordaid, PSI Europe, ICCO, Rutgers and GGD Amsterdam have a generic security plan in place and COC Netherlands responded that they know how to deal with difficult situations.

Detailed information on who is doing what and the key concepts mentioned to address SGD in advocacy and programmes

Below more detailed findings are provided on what NGOs are doing to address SGD, and more specifically the key concepts that they use to frame discussions about SGD are mentioned. These framing key concepts relate to the strategies NGOs use to address SGD in their advocacy and programmes. Framing is an important theory about influencing the choices people make about how to process information, in this case about SGD. Key concepts represent these frames and help organise and structure the meaning of the messages that are provided about SGD.

Who is doing what?

- **Mission**

The survey asked whether the promotion of human rights of LGBTI or the elimination of discrimination against sexual minorities is included in the mission and/or vision of the organisations.

Of the 20 organisations responding, 13 have included this in their mission. Cordaid and Simavi both answered negatively to this question, but did say that non-discrimination was included in their SRHR policies. Simavi has a position paper on sexual and gender diversity and "making informed decisions regarding SRHR free from discrimination, coercion and violence" is a key element of Simavi's organisational ambition and Theory of Change.

- **Policy in place**

If there is no attention given in an organisation's mission, a policy addressing sexual and gender diversity might be in place, since all organisations come across sexual minorities in their field of work.

Only 7 (Rutgers, GGD Amsterdam, Hivos, Oxfam Novib, GNP+, Amref Flying Doctors, COC Netherlands) out of 20 organisations stated there was a policy in place.

Rutgers has sexual and gender diversity as one of the focus areas in the new strategy (2017-2020) and implements several programmes in consortiums, among others with CHOICE, Dance4Life and Hivos. For example, the Right Here Right Now (RHRN) programme, funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, envisions a world where all young people are able to access quality and youth-friendly health services, and are not afraid to openly express who they are and who they love.

- **Advocacy for equal rights and inclusiveness**

Advocating for equal rights for LGBTI people and inclusiveness of human rights for LGBTI people is a main pillar to which Rutgers and partners, among others CHOICE, Dance4Life, Hivos and COC Netherlands are attributing.
The survey made clear that advocacy programmes on LGBTI programmes are being implemented by 8 out of 20 organisations.

Although Aidsfonds says that it does not to pay attention to human rights promotion for specifically LGBTI people nor to discrimination against sexual

minorities, the organisation was established because of the needs within these communities. Remarkably Aidsfonds also does not have a policy in place and from the outcomes of the survey it also seems that they do not undertake advocacy on the subject. However, Aidsfonds works with sex workers-led organisations and networks that target female, male (often Men who have Sex with Men or men who identify themselves as gay and bisexual) and transgender sex workers in many developing countries. They implement programmes in terms of health services and programme interventions that address the specific needs of sex workers who identify themselves as LGBTI people. Aidsfonds also runs MSM programmes on a national level.

- **Mainstreaming SGD within SRHR programmes**

Mainstreaming SGD means the integration of a sexual and gender diversity perspective into the preparation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of SRHR (internal and external) policies, regulatory measures, advocacy and spending programmes, with a view to promoting equality for LGBTI, and combating discrimination.

Mainstreaming SGD is at the core of Rutgers' Get Up Speak Out (GUSO) programme, funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Members of this programme consortium are: Aidsfonds, Simavi, CHOICE and Dance4Life. KIT is not a consortium member but is researching and evaluating this 5-year programme, through programme performance studies at base-, mid- and end-line in 5 countries and comparative research studies in 2 countries, using mixed methods.

COC Netherlands and Hivos but also Oxfam Novib in certain projects are NGOs which directly work with LGBTI NGOs and activists and help them to mainstream inclusiveness in mainly health services.

Who is doing what (continuation) **and key concepts mentioned to address SGD?**

- **Key concepts Inclusion and being non-discriminative**

According to its website, KIT empowers and promotes the social, economic and political inclusion of all people. KIT's approach to sustainable development is also founded in the principle of inclusion. KIT launched the SDG House in September 2017 in a bid to accelerate progress towards achieving the UN's 17 Sustainable Development Goals, along with tenants, employees, other stakeholders and the international community. The SDGs were agreed on the basis that they would include everyone, without discrimination, and would 'leave no one behind'.

However not specifically mentioning SGD, inclusion is the buzzword to working non-discriminatively. Dance4Life started off as a movement intended to remind world leaders of their commitments to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to combat HIV/AIDS. Over time Dance4Life has broadened its horizon from HIV/AIDS to Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, which will, assumingly, include SGD. However, this is not clear in the related website.

Hivos believes that all people should be able to have control over their own bodies and sexuality; that people should be able to express their sexual orientation and gender identity freely, without having to suffer threats, violence or exclusion. At the heart of the organisation, its mission, Hivos talks explicitly about SGD and states to have a long track record of supporting both small LGBT initiatives and helping to build strong LGBT movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America and to be the most daring organisations when it comes to sexual rights and diversity[3].

Simavi's mission is to achieve a healthy life for all and to ensure that disadvantaged people in low- and middle-income countries practice healthy behaviours based on their own free and informed decisions. Inclusion is a key element of Simavi's approach, although sexual and gender diversity is not explicitly mentioned. Simavi developed an Organisation Inclusion Assessment Tool to help Simavi and partner organisations become more inclusive. Together with other members of the WASH Alliance International (WAI) Simavi also developed tools for implementing inclusive WASH programmes.

- **Focus on Youth as a target group and as a key concept mobilise them as a motor for promoting equality for LGBTI**

Right Here Right Now targets young people and the policies affecting youth. RHRN mobilises young people for advocating equal rights for LGBTI.

RNW Media's approach is to facilitate young people to form opinions and influence society. RNW Media's main tool to amplify young people's voices is the digital media they use themselves. Recently RNW launched the Chinese Love Matters site, which also addresses LGBTI issues.

GGD Amsterdam supported KIT with training on motivational interviewing for young MSM in Bangladesh. GGD Amsterdam has also put together a brochure about care provision in Amsterdam for foreign, homosexual, lesbian, bisexual and transgender youth.

---

[3] Hivos. About Sexual Rights and Diversity. See: https://hivos.org/about-sexual-rights-and-diversity

- **Focus on key populations and as key concept facilitate their access to health services as a way to address SGD**

Aidsfonds focuses on those population groups who are affected the most by HIV due to stigma and discrimination, criminalisation and exclusion. Other organisations and local government often ignore these groups, such as key populations, children, mothers and young people in developing countries and also people living with HIV all over the world, female, male and transgender sex workers and LGBT people, including Men who have Sex with Men and people who use drugs. Aidsfonds runs MSM programmes on a national level, is the lead agency for international HIV/AIDS programmes Bridging the Gaps (in which COC and MSMGF are also involved) and PITCH (also runs a LGBTI programme together with IHAA) and is involved in GUSO.

GNP+ supports and nurtures a powerful and united worldwide social movement of people living with HIV. GNP+ has a specific focus as a one theme organisation.

One of AFEW International's ambitions is to advance the ability of key populations to access health services without stigma and discrimination as well as mobilising and supporting communities and NGOs to improve the health of key populations, specifically with regards to HIV, TB, hepatitis and SRH. The focus of the organisation lies with key populations and their access to health services and as such is not focusing on SGD.

In collaboration with the GGD Amsterdam and Bandhu Social Welfare Society, KIT has successfully piloted an innovative motivational intervention (MI+) approach to enhance the access of young MSM towards Sexual Reproductive Health services.

COC Netherlands uses the strategy of Power within and *inside-out*: COC Netherlands supports coalitions of LGBTIs and straight people and empowers them to make a change from within their own community or organisation. COC Netherlands is part of Bridging the Gaps together with AFEW, GNP+ and Aidsfonds, financially supported by Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This programme addresses the common challenges faced by sex workers, people who use drugs and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people, including MSM, in terms of human right violations. The programme supports them in accessing much needed HIV and health services.

- **Health for all as key concept for addressing SGD**

SRHR and WASH are central to AMREF's work. Within SRHR all subjects around sexuality and safe delivery can count on AMREF's attention. Although AMREF targets the subject of sexuality, they do not specifically target SGD.

PSI-Europe is part of PSI, which is a global non-profit organisation focusing on the encouragement of healthy behaviour and affordability of health products and services. While funds are not specifically allocated to LGBTI related programmes, PSI network members work to strengthen the public and private sector's ability to provide health products and services to priority populations, particularly MSM, who are at risk of HIV infection. These are often much targeted programmes, tailored to the needs of the target groups.

Female Health Company, as the global public sector division of Veru Healthcare, is devoted to providing capacity building on SRHR and the female condom to countries all over the world. While not at the core of their activities, FHC does deal with sexual and gender diversity in the many holistic trainings they provide over the world and the way in which SGD relates to the FC2 female condom.

- **Injustice and dignity as key concept for addressing SGD**

Oxfam Novib is part of a global movement of people working together to end the injustice of poverty for everyone. Together this movement takes on the big issues that keep people poor, such as inequality, discrimination against women, climate change, and the eviction of people from their land. A specific focus on SGD could not be found on the website. Still, Oxfam has a Sexual Diversity and Gender Identity Rights Policy4. In addition, Oxfam Novib country offices supported last years the rights of sexual minorities in LGBT projects in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Pakistan by improving approaches through knowledge sharing, and providing robust models for related programmes globally.

ICCO works towards a world in which people can live in dignity and well-being, a world without poverty and injustice. To achieve this, they embrace two core principles: securing sustainable livelihoods and justice and dignity for all. Inclusion is a red thread and according to the website, the ICCO-cooperation strategy plan 2020 states to work with people and organisations irrespective of their religion, class, race, gender, sexual orientation or physical challenges.

---

4 Oxfam. Sexual Diversity and Gender Identity Rights Policy. See: https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/story/sexual_diversity_and_gender_identity_rights_policy.pdf

Prisma states that it is their responsibility to follow in Christ's footsteps and take care of humanity and people who suffer, are in distress, or experience injustice. However, there is no mention of LGBTI issues on the website.

Cordaid states on their website that it is their job to leave the world a better place for future generations: a world where people are safe, can live with dignity, develop themselves and have the freedom to speak out. There is no mentioning of SGD. The Jeune S3 alliance, led by Cordaid and funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, focuses on key populations and their access to health services, as well as their rights issues. PSI-Europe is part of this alliance.

ResultsinHealth provides technical advice on issues related to Maternal, Newborn and Child Health, Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, Access to Essential Medicines, and Poverty Reduction. ResultsinHealth regularly conducts research studies and assists partners in doing so. Although SRH is one of ResultsinHealth's focus areas and they regularly conduct research on these areas, they do not implement research on LGBTI issues.

- **Education as key concept**

Several Dutch NGOs are known to include sexuality diversity in their sexuality education programmes in developing countries: RNW Media, Rutgers, Edukans, ICCO Cooperation with Amref in Ethiopia and Butterfly Works.

In addition, a Netherlands coordinated network which should be mentioned here is GALE[5]; the Global Alliance for LGBT Education. GALE, which is a formal cooperating partner of UNESCO, is a learning community focusing on education about lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) issues, that promotes the full inclusion of people who are disadvantaged because of their sexual orientation, sexual identity, and their expression by identifying, enhancing and sharing educational expertise. GALE works in Europe, as well as Africa, Asia and South America.

[5] See: https://www.gale.info/

3a.2 Universities

The universities involved in the mapping are Maastricht University, University of Amsterdam, Radboud UMC, Radboud University and ISS/EUR.

- **Policy on LGBTI inclusiveness**

Only ISS/EUR and the Radboud University currently have a policy on LGBTI inclusiveness. The University of Amsterdam has a policy in the making.

- **Protocol on homophobic behaviour**

Only ISS/EUR and the Radboud UMC have a protocol on homophobic behaviour. The Radboud University has a general protocol for undesirable behaviour and availability of confidential advisors. The University of Amsterdam is in the process of setting up a discrimination hot-line.

- **Sponsoring LGBTI activists**

Only respondents from Maastricht University and the ISS/EUR mentioned that their university sponsors LGBTI activists. In the past, Scholars at Risk who were specifically dealing with LGBTI issues, have been placed at the Radboud University. The Gender & Diversity department as well as the Executive Board (matching) paid for the placement. This is not a structural policy however.

- **LGBTI Courses**

The ISS/EUR, University of Amsterdam, Radboud University and Radboud UMC state they have included LGBTI-related issues in their courses. The Maastricht University does not have specific LGBTI courses but has courses that address stigma and group dynamics and offers the option for students to do their internship on LGBTI-related questions.

- **Research on LGBTI issues**

4 out of 5 universities undertake research on LGBTI issues. The respondent from the Radboud UMC is not aware of any research on the subject.

The following points were also identified by the survey:

- The Radboud UMC is the only university that has a fixed amount of budget periodically invested for LGBTI issues as part of their HRM policy. The Radboud UMC was awarded the Pink Carpet Award[6] in 2016. The Pink Carpet Award contributes to awareness on sexual and gender diversity. To get the Pink Carpet Award, Radboud UMC successfully completed a

---

[6] See https://www.radboudumc.nl/nieuws/2016/radboudumc-eerste-ziekenhuis-met-roze-loper

trajectory to increase social acceptance of sexual and gender diversity through the Pink Carpet Tolerance Scan ®.

- The department of Gender & Diversity Studies of the Radboud University structurally invests in education and research on sexuality, including LGBTI.
- The University of Amsterdam is the only university with an affinity group for LGBTI students. However, most universities in the Netherlands have student associations, which also explicitly target LGBTI students.
- The ISS/EUR is the only university with a scholarship for LGBTI activists which is called the Dreilinden Scholarship[7] - two are available every year.
- The University of Amsterdam has a Diversity Committee, which considers diversity in regard to ethnicity, socioeconomic background, gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation. The Radboud UMC has a specific working group on Sexual Diversity.

---

[7] See https://www.iss.nl/en/prospective...scholarships/dreilinden-scholarship-lgbti-activists and https://www.iss.nl/en/education/ma-development-studies/funding-and-scholarships

3b. Reflection on the survey

In summary, the survey shows that more than half of responding NGOs address SGD explicitly. However, it does not make exactly clear what NGOs and universities precisely do and which exact strategies they use to address SGD. With COC Netherlands as the exception, for most of the organisations, sexual and gender diversity and human rights for LGBTI proved to be explicitly or implicitly only part of their work, meaning the organisations did not consider SGD a full issue.

The above means that SGD proved mainly to be mainstreamed in the programmes and/or policies of NGOs and universities. But it is still unclear to which degree their mainstreaming of SGD means the integration of a sexual and gender diversity perspective into the preparation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of SRHR (internal and external) policies, regulatory measures, advocacy and programmes, with a view to promoting equality for LGBTI, and combating discrimination. It is also not possible to conclude whether and to what extent a specific budget is allocated to SGD. These gaps need further research to achieve better insight.

Interesting is that NGOs and universities address SGD as part of the issue of working on specific key concepts. These key concepts include human rights, equality, non-discrimination, inclusion, injustice, dignity and health for all. It is then important to know how the key concepts shape the basis of which strategies and which strategies are most effective in addressing SGD, including in which context these strategies work best.

Supporting LGBTIs and advocating for equality and for LGBTI people to have the same human rights as anybody else is still a controversial issue in most developing countries, especially in countries where homo- or transsexual acts are criminalised. Even when acts related to SGD are not criminalised, sexual and gender diversity is still a highly sensitive issue in many cultures, as it often is perceived as not in line with or even against local traditional, cultural and religious norms. When promoting human rights for all including for LGBTI people, it is therefore crucial to know effective strategies to mainstream and be able to address SGD by using the right key concepts.

To better define which strategies work well in which contexts and under which conditions, further research is needed, based on the report of Share-Net Netherlands' desk research about effectiveness of strategies which was conducted simultaneously with this mapping, as well as the discussion in Chapter 4 regarding the strategies of the Dutch ministries.

4a. Results of the Ministries: who addresses what and how regarding SGD in Dutch development cooperation policies?

To know more about the strategies used in Dutch development cooperation policies and who addresses what and how regarding sexual and gender diversity, interviews with Dutch Ministries have been carried out for this mapping of Share-Net Netherlands. Interviewees have been one representative of the Department Emancipation of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (MoECS) and one representative of the department for Social Development of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA). Instead of sexual diversities in Dutch policies usually the terminology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) is used.

In the Dutch development policy[8] both Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) and the human rights for Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) are focal points of Netherlands' development cooperation. SOGI is addressed separately within the human rights department of the MoFA and also integrated within SRHR by the department of Social Development (DSO) of the MoFA.

Dutch leadership in these themes is supposedly a direct result of the liberal attitude towards sexuality the Dutch have developed since the 1960s. In addition to the fundamental equality of women, the importance of self-determination regarding sexuality, birth control and abortion, the Dutch have a tradition in advocating the rights of LGBTI, addressed both within SRHR and separately within human rights. In line with this open attitude, the Dutch development cooperation policies have always emphasised the importance of an atmosphere in which all aspects of sexuality can be discussed freely and safely.

The MoECS and the MoFA have committed themselves to European guidelines for promoting human rights of LGBTI and protecting them against discrimination and violence[9]. Since 2007, these guidelines have been used by all Dutch embassies and consulates. These guidelines state that the Netherlands will make efforts worldwide to prevent and fight discrimination of LGBTI people by governments and abolish the criminalisation of homosexual acts.

---

[8] NCDO (March, 2013). *The Dutch and development cooperation. Ahead of the crowd or trailing behind?* See: http://www.ncdo.nl/sites/default/files/Report%20Analysis%20The%20Dutch%20and%20Development%20Cooperation%20FINAL%202013%2003%2004.pdf

[9] see https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2010/09/29/mensenrechten-en-seksuele-orientatie and in English https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/137584.pdf

The basis of these Dutch development cooperation policies is the principle of non-discrimination and the Yogyakarta Principles[10], which cover the 29 rights of LGBTI people. The main rights of LGBTI include the right to freedom of expression, to privacy, to information, to associate and meet, to labour, to health, to life, to freedom of religion, to a fair trial, to indemnity of arbitrary detention, to not being tortured and to not violate the rights of their loved ones, such as relatives and friends.

Specifically, the MoECS has an international role on emancipation, which is the Minister's responsibility and which is broader than just education and relevant in international cooperation with CEDAW, CSW, EU etc. The Dutch MoECS is the first responsible Dutch ministry which is concerned with gender identity and sexual diversity policies.

Especially being the focus of the work of the MoECS, the Dutch government champions human rights for LGBTI in the EU but also worldwide by[11]:

- advocating a coherent European approach to tackling discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression;
- advocating the mutual recognition of same-sex marriages within the EU;
- exchanging experience within the EU on promoting LGBTI rights and with countries taking the lead on this issue elsewhere in the world;
- working with other NATO member states to improve the position and safety of gays in the military;
- lobbying in the EU for greater cooperation between LGBTI organisations and the police in tackling homophobic and transphobic violence;
- providing financial support via Dutch embassies for local LGBTI organisations in countries where LGBTIs are at risk;
- offering protection to LGBTIs who are being threatened;
- invariably objecting whenever an EU country is preparing legislation that discriminates against LGBTIs;
- beyond the EU, boosting LGBTI rights and pooling resources by strengthening networks such as European Focal Points Network and European Rainbow Cities, and by actively contributing to such international organisations as UNESCO, the OECD and UNICEF.

---

[10] See: www.yogyakartaprinciples.org
[11] Website of the Dutch government. See: https://www.government.nl/topics/gay-rights/lgbt-rights-worldwide

Supporting and advocating LGBTIs is highly politically sensitive and needs courage

Supporting and advocating LGBTIs for having equal human rights is perceived to be a highly sensitive and political issue. It cannot be easily addressed with local partner organisations in Africa and Asia. In the first instance, such a difficulty occurs because it relates to whether homo- or transsexual acts are criminalised. In 72 countries worldwide, homosexual acts are still illegal and in eight of them these acts are even punishable with the death penalty[12]. Although not all of these states implement their discriminatory laws, their mere existence usually reinforces a culture of permissiveness and impunity regarding discrimination and violence towards LGBTI. Secondly, also in countries where homosexuality is not criminalised, supporting LGBTI rights is still sensitive, as local traditional cultural and religion norms often fuel discrimination, marginalisation and violence of persons with a sexual orientation or gender identity that does not conform to – perceived - majority norms.

For the Dutch policy on development cooperation, it means for example that in November 2007, the government of the Netherlands demanded all Dutch ambassadors serving in countries receiving Dutch development aid, to begin implementation of effective LGBTI human rights protections in all countries. Also, they had to start advocating for the decriminalisation of homosexuality in those countries where it is still criminalised – in 2007 homosexuality was still criminalised in 18 of the 36 priority development countries that received a large majority of the Netherlands' development assistance[13]. Today the Dutch government works with 15 partner countries in development cooperation14, of which 12 still criminalise same sex acts. In addition, there are specific programmes for the Great Lakes region and the Horn of Africa, where 3 of the 6 countries involved criminalise same sex acts.

In addition, at present the Dutch and Swedish Governments regularly offer direct and indirect support to LGBTI organisations and activists working in dangerous environments. For example, during the recent debate over the Same-Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act in Nigeria, the Dutch Embassy provided direct financial support to help Nigerian human rights organisations organise in opposition to the bill. This lead is increasingly followed by other European embassies.

---

[12] ILGA (May 2017) *State-sponsored homophobia*. A world survey of sexual orientation laws: Criminalisation, protection and recognition. See:
http://ilga.org/downloads/2017/ILGA_State_Sponsored_Homophobia_2017_WEB.pdf
[13] The Council for Global Equality (Nov. 2007) Providing civil society support to LGBT organizations and human rights efforts in other countries – *Dutch Embassy support, Swedish Government strategy.* In: BUILDING A STRATEGY FOR AN LGBT-INCLUSIVE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY. See:
http://www.globalequality.org/storage/documents/pdf/lgbt_foreign_policy_project-discussion_paper.pdf
[14] Dutch Development Results 2016 in Perspective. See: https://www.dutchdevelopmentresults.nl/country

Strategies to address SOGI; reflections on the two interviews with MoECS and MoFA

According to the two interviews with the ministries of MoECS and MoFA, Dutch development cooperation policies use different strategies to address SOGI.

The MoECS mainly uses the concept of safety as an entry, for example in safe cities, Rainbow Cities, and safe schools with its focus on fighting homo- and transphobic bullying. Diversity and rights can also be entrances, in negotiations at higher political level and in the MoECS supported Gay-Straight Alliances (GSA)[15]. In education, MoECS supports a comprehensive approach in close collaboration with UNESCO, consisting of 7 elements: effective policies, relevant curricula and learning materials, training and support for staff, support for students and families, information and strategic partnerships, and monitoring and evaluation[16].

The MoFA also uses the concept of rights when negotiating at higher policy levels, for example at the UN. However, the concept of rights is not often used at local level except for example at IDAHO and Human Rights Day on 10th December, when embassies want to make the rights of LGBTI explicitly visible, even in developing countries. However, when addressing SRHR in developing countries the use of human rights to address SOGI is often too confronting and can hinder and even block the advancement of the whole SRHR agenda and endanger local LGBTI NGOs and people. Therefore, other less confronting strategies have to be used. As entrances to negotiations and discussions about SOGI, other less provocative concepts can include diversity, discrimination, health in general and sexual health, autonomy and only when possible, sexual rights.

The collaboration between MoECS and MoFA is essential as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs complements the work of MoECS. According to the interviewees, this collaboration is so strong today that it might even be a role model for other countries; their collaboration shows that the MoECS practices what MoFA preaches. This underlines the credibility of a consistent internal and external – comprehensive - government policy. MoFA and MoECS influence each other mutually. For example, MoECS's initiative of national strategic partnerships is based on the external strategic partnerships in the area of development cooperation which are facilitated by the MoFA.

---

[15] Best practices from The Netherlands. OHCHR request as follow-up to Res. 27/32 ("Human rights, sexual orientation and gender identity"). See: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Discrimination/LGBT/Res_27_32/Netherlands.pdf
[16] UNESCO (2016). *Out in the Open.* Education sector responses to violence based on sexual orientation and gender identity/expression (PDF). Paris, UNESCO. pp. 15, 61–62, 65, 69–75, 82–83. ISBN 978-92-3-100150-5

4b. Discussion

Explicitly advocating and negotiating for the rights of LGBTI people is still urgently needed. Criminalisation, discrimination and violence and lack of information and access to health services disproportionally affect the quality of lives of LGBTI people in the partner countries to which Dutch development aid is provided. There is no doubt about the value of negotiations at higher political level such as in the UN. Although the struggle for these rights has been relatively successful, especially in Europe, still more countries should recognise legal and sexual rights for LGBTI people and have legalised gay marriage and/or civil partnerships. The need for decriminalisation, fighting stigma, discrimination and violence and ensuring safety and dignity justifies the priority of claiming human rights of LGBTI people in Dutch development cooperation, as well as at local levels in Africa and Asia.

In addition, in spite of the silence surrounding diversity in sexual orientation and gender identity, explicitly discussing these rights in taboo societies can raise awareness and provoking debates might result in acceptance of this diversity in the long term. However, there is a tension between claiming human rights for LGBTI and simultaneously being able to address other SRHR issues, as SOGI is often perceived as absent in the culture and according to the general social norm seen as contradicting cultural beliefs and values, unfortunately often also supported by legislation. In this context addressing human rights for LGBTI can be too controversial and hinder or even block the whole SRHR agenda and endanger LGBTI NGOs and people.

Choosing the right strategy to address SOGI is thus crucial for gaining acceptance of sexual and gender diversity (SGD). It is important to find common ground as a starting point for subsequently mainstreaming SOGI from there on and work towards decriminalisation. When the concept of human rights for LGBTI is too controversial, a concept has to be found upon which it is possible to agree first. This can be for example the concept of equality and rejecting exclusion and discrimination or the concept of health or sexual health for all or safety. It can also be the concept of human rights, starting with the right to self-determination, or the right to access information, education and health services. When common ground is found, a next step is using this common ground for discussing SGD in a dialogue without imposing norms and values, but making small steps towards acceptance or celebration or at least tolerance of SGD in mutual respect.

Local policy makers, community and religious leaders, service providers and educators have to be convinced of the need to accept SGD. It is then important to have local experts on board. Western NGOs can support, but local organisations (SRHR and human rights NGOs together with LGBTI NGOs) should

be in the lead, as Western experts, NGOs and policy makers are easily perceived to be imposing their Western norms and values.

Local experts, progressive community and/or religious leaders, universities and local policy makers can be involved as deliverers of the message of accepting and preferably celebrating sexual and gender diversity. In addition, alliance-building of local NGOs in collaboration with supporting alliances of international NGOs can make a difference as a common policy, advocacy and voice of many is more influential. Alliance-building in the Netherlands around the issue of SGD as well as in partner countries in the South is therefore an additional, supportive strategy in getting sexual and gender diversity adopted as an inevitable part of SRHR.

Today evidence on the effectiveness of strategies to address SOGI is hard to find and this kind of research is still scarce. Research is needed on which strategies work well, when, with whom, where and under which conditions. But even then, the effectiveness of strategies is difficult to assess and measure. Careful consideration of the (sexual) health evidence on sexual and gender diversity and public health implications is critical, but understanding the context of the debate is no less important to the task of responding to public concerns.
Being able to frame discussions and to articulate arguments that are more easily adopted can help authorities' responsiveness to communities as the dialogue evolves further. A lot can be learned from research on framing theories. In essence, framing theories suggest that how something is presented to the audience (called "the frame") influences the choices people make about how to process that information. Frames are abstractions that work to organise or structure message meaning[17].

To conclude with the views of the interviewees:
A Dutch public, Western, strong positioning on human rights for LGBTI has not always been effective, especially in African countries. Still, in the long term it might be necessary and effective to be visible and vocal and in this way create a contra-reaction. This is needed in the long term to influence the public debate within a country and open the eyes of the local population. So, even a negative reaction might be necessary to mainstream sexual and gender diversity, being possibly effective in the long term. Evidence on whether this direct, human rights strategy works well and under which conditions is urgently needed.
But additionally and even more importantly, more efforts are needed to find well-working, indirect strategies which are both practical and effective in

---

[17] Mass Communication Theory. *Framing Theory*. See: https://masscommtheory.com/theory-overviews/framing-theory/

mainstreaming sexual and gender diversity and promoting human rights for LGBTI without hindering the other domains of the SRHR agenda or endangering local LGBTI NGOs and people.

Finally, continuously keeping each other aware and commonly deciding about which, when, how and what strategy is best in what context, might serve the Dutch development cooperation policy on SGD, especially regarding the collaboration between the MoECS and the DSO and the human rights departments of the MoFA, active on sexual and gender diversity.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This mapping has provided a general insight into how a limited number of Dutch NGOs and universities aim to address sexual and gender diversity (SGD) and what kind of activities they implement regarding this issue. It has also shown how two main Dutch ministries, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, address SGD and promote human rights for LGBTI, either integrated in SRHR or separately within human rights. Finally, it shows which key concepts and related strategies the NGOs and ministries use for addressing SGD.

A clear and complete image of who is doing what exactly, is unfortunately not feasible as the incomplete responses and the discrepancies within these responses do not allow this. What is clear however, is that most of the responding NGOs do not have an explicit strategy, a fact which is noteworthy in itself. Therefore, it is difficult to draw straightforward conclusions and classify and clarify in detail the strategies to address SGD which are used in Dutch development cooperation.

In spite of these limitations, the following conclusions and recommendations are meant to help improve Dutch efforts in addressing sexual and gender diversity (SGD) in development cooperation.

Need for further research into the gaps and effectiveness of Dutch efforts

- Most NGOs of this mapping mainstream SGD as part of their SRHR work, but it is unclear to what extent the integration of a sexual and gender diversity perspective is included in the preparation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of their internal and external policies, regulatory measures, advocacy, and programmes, with a view to promoting equality for LGBTI and combating discrimination. A clear strategy often lacks and it is not clear to what extent they allocate a specific budget to SGD.
The mapping and the desk study show that effective strategies and successes on addressing LGBTI rights are few and far between. The issue is therefore not effectively tackled by Dutch efforts.
There is however, still an urgent need to promote living up to human rights to all, but meet at least the demand for specialised health services and information for sexual minorities, and this work needs to be prioritised. While challenging, some examples illustrate that this is

definitely achievable, like the efforts of Hivos[18], COC[19], Oxfam Novib[20], the Dutch SRHR Alliance, Dance4Life and Rutgers[21] and IPPF[22]. Targeted, bold and innovative interventions are needed to mainstream sexual minorities into health programming, and empower people to enjoy their sexuality in good health and without fear of stigma, discrimination and violence[23].

Recommendations to address gaps and effectiveness of Dutch efforts

Further research is urgently needed that could provide better insight into the gaps of Dutch efforts to promote sexual and gender diversity in development cooperation. Such research should address how investment in resources and specific allocated budgets of NGOs and universities can improve Dutch efforts, preferably in a better cooperation and partnership.

Tools have to be available for gaining better insight into what extent NGOs meet full mainstreaming. Self-assessment tools can help define the own position of NGOs in the Netherlands as well in the South. Gaps can be identified and would aid discussions regarding whether improvement of the own position is wanted, to what extent and how. Examples of self-assessment tools are the scale of Olsson[24], ranging from tolerance and accepting sexual and gender diversity up to celebrating SGD, and the score cards and score board used in the mainstreaming project of Dance4Life, Rutgers and the SRHR Alliance in Indonesia [25].

Joint advocacy should be strengthened and include that, contrary to international standards, same-sex sexual acts are currently criminalised in a large number of states the Dutch ministries and NGOs are working with. This violation of rights of LGBTI people puts them at risk of severe physical and mental harm, which can be the result of direct attack, correctional punishment, 'treatments', or the indirect effect of living a

---

[18] Hivos. LGBT Rights Facts & Figures. See: https://hivos.org/lgbt-rights-facts-figures and https://www.hivos.org/focal-area/lgbt-rights
[19] See: https://www.coc.nl/engels
[20] Oxfam Novib. Human Rights of Sexual Minorities in Pakistan, Zimbabwe and South Africa. See: https://www.oxfamnovib.nl/donors-partners/about-oxfam/projects-and-programs/human-rights-of-sexual-minorities-in-pakistan,-zimbwabe-and-south-africa
[21] Rutgers. Sexual and gender diversity. See: https://www.rutgers.international/what-we-do/sexual-and-gender-diversity
[22] IPPF (2010). *IPPF Framework for Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE)*. Page 8. IPPF, London. UK. See: https://www.ippf.org/sites/default/files/ippf_framework_for_comprehensive_sexuality_education.pdf
[23] IPPF (2010). *IPPF Framework for Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE)*. Page 8. IPPF, London. UK. See: https://www.ippf.org/sites/default/files/ippf_framework_for_comprehensive_sexuality_education.pdf
[24] IPPF (2010). *IPPF Framework for Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE)*. Page 8. IPPF, London. UK. See: https://www.ippf.org/sites/default/files/ippf_framework_for_comprehensive_sexuality_education.pdf
[25] RutgersWPF and Dance4Life (2012). *Mainstreaming sexual and gender diversity in SRHR and Hiv programming in Indonesia*, Page 25 of the Final report on a thematic learning programme (TLP). See: https://www.rutgers.international/sites/rutgersorg/files/SDTools/DEF%20Final%20report%20on%20the%20TLP%20in%20Indonesia.pdf

life of fear and repression. Where needed, advocacy should focus on eliminating the lack of legal recognition, which means that there is no imperative for programmers and service providers to ensure that SRH services are relevant and accessible to LGBTI people.

Need to include sexual and gender diversity in a truly rights-based approach for SRHR

- Claiming to work with rights as part of SRHR unavoidably requires promoting rights for all. This means that rights for LGBTI people cannot be denied in either mission and/or programmes that focus on SRHR. Still, not all Dutch NGOs working in SRHR include sexual and gender diversity in their mission, policies, advocacy and programmes.
Worldwide many SRHR organisations - even those with a strong human rights vision – do not fully apply their rights-based vision in practice and leave sexual and gender diversity untouched as it is a too sensitive, contentious and political issue. Mainstreaming can help to address sexual and gender diversity, even in hostile environments. Effective mainstreaming towards more inclusive programming has proven to ask for a change of management systems and organisational policies and – most of all – a change of staff attitudes at all levels[26],[27].

Recommendations to move towards inclusion of sexual and gender diversity into SRHR

Internal advocacy is urgently needed for making Dutch NGOs and in their turn NGOs in the South, better aware of the need to address sexual and gender diversity within a truly rights-based approach within SRHR, and what mainstreaming sexual and gender diversity means. A process of internal mainstreaming should be followed by a process of external mainstreaming of sexual and gender diversity towards other organisations, including partners in the global South. For this, attention also has to be given to how to effectively conduct such advocacy and support programming efforts.

---

[26] Bouko Bakker, Jo Reinders and Liesbeth Hofs (2016). *Sexual Diversity. Building bridges towards mainstreaming of sexual and gender diversity in SRHR organisations* - lessons learned in Africa and Asia. Rutgers & SRHR Alliance, Utrecht, the Netherlands. See: https://www.rutgers.international/what-we-do/sexual-and-gender-diversity
See also: RutgersWPF and Dance4Life (2012). *Mainstreaming sexual and gender diversity in SRHR and Hiv programming in Indonesia*. Final Report on the Thematic Learning Programme in Indonesia. See: Final report on the TLP in Indonesia
[27] IPPF (2011). Lesson 2. In: *Sexual diversity, from the margins to the mainstream*. See: https://www.ippf.org/resource/sexual-diversity-margins-mainstream

Need to address current fragmentation of efforts in the Global South

- Addressing sexual and gender diversity in Dutch development cooperation is fragmented. A coherent strategy in the Netherlands is lacking. There is hardly cooperation with Dutch NGOs which directly work with LGBTI NGOs and activists in the South such as COC Netherlands and Hivos. Mainstreaming sexual and gender diversity in SRHR and human rights NGOs in the South is most effective when done together with local LGBTI organisations and activists. Local experts are needed to convince local policy makers, community/religious leaders, service providers, communities and educators.

Recommendations to address fragmentation

Partnering between Dutch NGOs which directly work with local LGBTI NGOs and activists in the Global South should be strengthened as this in turn will strengthen mainstreaming efforts of sexual and gender diversity in SRHR and human rights NGOs in those countries. Dutch NGOs can jointly provide support in funding, situation analyses, capacity building, functioning as watchdogs and developing security policies and related issues. Besides, commonly addressing SGD in a country is more effective.

Preferably a two-way model of mainstreaming is recommended in addressing sexual and gender diversity within the South: local SRHR or human rights NGOs can be trained and helped mainstream SRHR in local LGBTI NGOs, while local LGBTI NGOs are supported and trained in mainstreaming SGD in local non-LGBTI NGOs. An example can be found in the SRHR Alliance and Dance4life-Rutgers' SGD mainstream project in Indonesia in Kenya[28].

Need for building common understanding around key concepts and strategies
- Dutch NGOs as well as the Dutch ministries address SGD as part of working on specific key concepts. These key concepts include human rights, equality, autonomy, diversity, non-discrimination, inclusion, injustice, dignity, sexual rights, sexual health and health for all. Key concepts are needed to find common ground and define strategies for how to address and discuss SGD. Key concepts can help frame sexual and gender diversity, as framing is important for influencing the choices people make about how to process information about SGD.

---

[28] Bouko Bakker, Jo Reinders and Liesbeth Hofs (2016). *Sexual Diversity. Building bridges towards mainstreaming of sexual and gender diversity in SRHR organisations* - lessons learned in Africa and Asia. Rutgers & SRHR Alliance, Utrecht, the Netherlands. See: https://www.rutgers.international/what-we-do/sexual-and-gender-diversity

Fortunately, some evidence about strategies and their effectiveness has now been documented in the report of Share-Net's desk research that was initiated simultaneously with this mapping. But it still appears that being able to address SGD effectively, using the right key concepts remains a crucial issue in promoting human rights for all, including for LGBTI.

Recommendations around key concepts and effective strategies

It is important that Dutch NGOs and Dutch ministries use a facilitated process to build consensus around key concepts that are likely to be most effective for addressing sexual and gender diversity within different contexts. This can be the concept of rights for LGBTI people, but when this is too confronting a less direct key concept such as discrimination, injustice or health.
Research and evaluation is needed to further improve insight into what kind of strategies work best in which contexts and under which conditions.

The Dutch ministries could take an active role in a more thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of Dutch interventions in sexual and gender diversity and assess whether current strategies are working. Funding rounds have not specifically targeted LGBTI people or collaboration in the South with LGBTI NGOs and this should be seen as a priority as it appears from this research that alliances, NGOs and projects targeted generically e.g. at 'youth', are not sufficiently addressing sexual and gender diversity needs.