REPORT: EXPERT WORKING MEETING ON SEXUALITY AND CHILD, EARLY AND FORCED MARRIAGE (CEFM)

MARCH 8-9, 2016

AMERICAN JEWISH WORLD SERVICE

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S HEALTH COALITION

care

GreeneWorks
Social change for health & development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The control and regulation of female sexuality—in particular, that of adolescent girls—remains a critical and often unaddressed way in which gender inequality manifests across different cultural contexts. Legal, religious, political and socioeconomic restrictions are placed on how women experience sensuality, intimacy and pleasure; express their sexual orientations and gender identities; engage in sexual relationships; ensure their own sexual and reproductive health; and in general, exercise sexual agency. For adolescent girls, these restrictions are further tightened because, like many youth, they lack access to power and the ability to make decisions for themselves.

In addition, societies increasingly view adolescence as a transition from childhood into adulthood; with this new designation of adolescence as a time of transition comes perceived new risks, including the perception that children and young adults face a greater possibility of being influenced or exploited at this formative, pivotal stage in their lives. Gender norms and ideas about sexual respectability play a crucial role here, in that many societies fear young women and familial honor will be impugned due to the young women's real or perceived sexual activity. As such, control of girls' sexuality during adolescence becomes an important focal point for many families and societies. Marriage as a social, cultural and economic institution plays a key role in this control.

Over the past few years, there has been a growing awareness that patriarchy and the control of sexuality matter in terms of understanding both the complex causes and the diverse solutions to the practice of child, early and forced marriage (CEFM). The 2015 resolution on child marriage adopted unanimously by the United Nations Human Rights Council included strong language urging governments to "promote and protect the human rights of all women and girls, including their right to have control over and decide freely and responsibly on matters related to their sexuality."[1] In addition, the May 2015 Girls Not Brides Global Members Meeting included the first-ever panel on sexuality and CEFM, "Keeping Girls at the Centre: Why Addressing Gender & Sexuality Is Critical to Ending Child Marriage."

Building on this awareness, 41 experts in the field of adolescent development and sexuality programs gathered in New York on March 8-9, 2016, to discuss the control of sexuality in the context of CEFM. Participants—who included local, national and global program implementers, government representatives, philanthropic foundations, researchers and policy advocates—brought extensive and diverse expertise on the issues of sexuality and CEFM. The two-day meeting was hosted by American Jewish World Service (AJWS), CARE USA, International Women's Health Coalition (IWHC), and GreeneWorks and held at Open Society Foundations. The meeting agenda and list of participants are provided in the appendix.

The meeting had four main objectives:

1: Establish a common framework for understanding control of female sexuality as a central driver of CEFM and discuss why sexuality is traditionally missing from the CEFM discourse

2: Discuss challenges and capacity-building needs in addressing sexuality in the context of CEFM

3: Share concrete examples of diverse, culturally specific, age appropriate, effective or promising, rights-based programming on sexuality at multiple levels (i.e. political, global, national, community)

4: Develop recommendations for addressing sexuality within the context of CEFM, including programmatic, research and advocacy gaps

Through presentations, large groups and small break-out discussions, several common themes arose, which are presented in the report below. Most importantly, the meeting helped clarify gaps and next steps regarding bringing sexuality into the conversation on adolescent health and development. Again and again, participants commented on how a meeting on sexuality was long overdue and highly important for their work. This meeting focused on sexuality within the scope of CEFM work; however, many participants noted that a larger conversation on sexuality and adolescent health—and sexuality, international development and human rights—needs to be undertaken.

---

[1] A/HRC/29/L.15, OP 12.

In recognition of the participants' will and expertise, this report first outlines the group's understanding of sexuality and contextualizes sexuality within CEFM—the framework for the meeting. As a group, the participants elaborated on the key principles of addressing sexuality, which are described in depth. A large section of the meeting was dedicated to the challenges of incorporating attention to sexuality within both rights and health frameworks, in addition to brainstorming potential approaches to overcoming these barriers; the main challenges and solutions from the larger discussions are presented. The report then outlines key recommendations based on concrete examples of recent and current work on sexuality. Finally, the report concludes with a presentation of major gaps and next steps identified in the meeting for increasing attention to sexuality in CEFM policy, programming and research.

UNDERSTANDING SEXUALITY

The seemingly simple task of starting a meeting with a common definition became complicated because this discussion focused on understanding sexuality—a highly complex concept that is personal yet public, physical as well as psychological. At this meeting of more than 40 experts, the goal was not to reach a consensus about language. In fact, many participants spoke about the impossibility and, more importantly, the inappropriateness of converging on definitions, given the complexity of the topic and diversity of contexts. Rather, experts from different areas described the need to understand how to address sexuality depending on the context, emphasizing that approaches to sexuality need to be tailored. Of course, having a definition of sexuality could also be powerful, and policy advocates spoke of the need to create an internal understanding of sexuality that can then be developed into a strategy that helps a wider range of experts reach a common understanding.

The World Health Organization attempted to address this need by providing a working definition of sexuality:

"...a central aspect of being human throughout life encompasses sex, gender identities and roles, sexual orientation, eroticism, pleasure, intimacy and reproduction. Sexuality is experienced and expressed in thoughts, fantasies, desires, beliefs, attitudes, values, behaviors, practices, roles and relationships. While sexuality can include all of these dimensions, not all of them are always experienced or expressed. Sexuality is influenced by the interaction of biological, psychological, social, economic, political, cultural, legal, historical, religious and spiritual factors." (WHO, 2006a).

Participants discussed this definition and its usefulness. Key to this definition is the idea that sexuality is not limited to sexual health. Rather, sexuality connects to a full range of rights. Understanding sexuality as a right means that aspects of nondiscrimination and societal levels of discrimination related to sexuality are worthy of investigation and action. For example, political and civil rights are called into question when we think about sexual rights. The public aspects of sexuality—such as freedom of individual sexual expression—as well as the more traditional private aspects of sexuality are important to this definition. Understanding sexuality as a phenomenon with public aspects pointed the discussion toward the tension between personal expression of sexuality, and family, community and state expectations of how people express sexuality in public. Additionally, recognition of sexuality as public puts it in the domain of development work and institutional policies that govern access to services; this recognition also demonstrates the importance of understanding the ways in which bodies such as the media and the state create and monitor sexuality.

Although formal definitions varied, experts from the meeting all agreed on the need to start with a core understanding of sexuality as a starting point for working together. They agreed that sexuality is about the private and public, about the body and the mind; it is about what one does in the home and about what one does in the community; it is about what one thinks and what one does—alone or with partners. The group also agreed that the link between gender—in terms of how it defines people's roles, identities and expressions—and sexuality—in terms of how it is exercised and controlled in light of gender norms—must be forefront in our understanding; gender and sexuality shape each other in varied ways that are difficult to tease apart. The focus on CEFM at this meeting highlighted the relationship between gender inequality and the control of adolescent girls' sexuality, but meeting participants were clear that experiences of sexuality should be recognized across one's lifespan and are not bounded by marriage—that sexuality is a central aspect of being human. As difficult as developing a common position may be, practitioners working in sexuality-related fields appreciated the complexity of trying to define the term.

CONTROL OF ADOLESCENT GIRLS' SEXUALITY AS A DRIVER OF CEFM

The organizers outlined the framework for the meetings through a presentation on understanding the control of adolescent girls' sexuality as a driver of CEFM. The presentation covered patriarchy and sexual relationships, reasons why sexuality is missing from the public discourse, and an argument for inclusion of sexuality into work on CEFM. Highlights from the presentation are outlined in the section below.

Patriarchy and sexual relationships

Patriarchal morality insists that feminine virginity is a precious asset that needs to be managed by men and commodified in diverse ways in many different cultural contexts; that management can take the forms of dowry and bride price. Virginity becomes a defining feature of girls' sexuality, which is otherwise often vilified. These same norms ensure that a girl's sexuality is tied to her family's honor, meaning that proper management of a girl's sexuality is central to the respectability of families. Therefore, young girls are forced to navigate their experience of sexuality under socially-sanctioned circumstances, lest they bring shame to themselves or their families. For example, social contact between the sexes is often viewed as dangerous—inevitably leading to sex—and consequently is prohibited in many communities. Social restrictions hinder girls' abilities to move outside of the home and thereby constrain their access to education, information and vital services like health care. Explicit discussions of sex are viewed as obscene in many contexts and as a disservice to young girls who, according to their communities, should enter their marriages "innocent" and "pure." As a result, girls are burdened with the responsibility of controlling their sexuality, yet are not given any information about how their bodies work and how to advocate for their own interests.

In this context, CEFM is seen as a solution, a way to enact social and familial control and maintain girls' purity. CEFM is a multifaceted solution—resulting in lower dowry demands, submissive and moldable new wives and girls dedicated to managing households and raising children. Sexually submissive wives are a broader metaphor for girls' inequitable roles within their households; the economics of marriage intensifies power disparities within households. In many contexts, younger girls are married to older men, which further exacerbates sexual and economic power dynamics. While boys experience more freedom regarding their sexuality than girls do and marriage has different meanings for girls and boys, both sexes may feel compelled and pressured to marry. Many girls see few to no alternatives to an early marriage, and short delays do not override the inevitability of eventual marriage. Therefore, marriage may become the most viable and attractive option to girls themselves.

Reasons sexuality is missing from development

Five main reasons why sexuality is generally missing from development were highlighted during the organizers' presentation. The goal of recognizing these conceptual and sectoral barriers to including sexuality in the mainstream development discourse was to use this understanding to formulate targeted solutions.

First of all, addressing sexuality is difficult because it challenges many different societal power structures and can highlight power imbalances in many other areas—for example, economic-related power imbalances, in the form of unpaid labor in the household provided by young brides. Second, strong values and emotions are connected to sexuality and sexual norms among community members, policymakers and development professionals alike, making it a difficult subject to discuss. Third, sexuality as a component of human social development within the international development field is weakly theorized, and there is a need to better understand which interventions around sexuality lead to development of effective programs and policies. Members of the international development community have diverse backgrounds and, as highlighted before, there is no consistent agreement on the concept of sexuality and what it means in different settings. Fourth, there is a focus on individuals and target populations in development work, rather than on relational approaches that target the multiple influences and actors that shape people's lives. Finally, international development arguments tend to focus on neoliberal economic impact. For example, arguments related to pregnancy outcomes tend to focus on the economic impacts of reproduction for the State. Child marriage is often rationalized as negative because it curtails education, harms health and slows the economy, but not because it structures a restrictive, non-egalitarian relationship that prevents girls from experiencing pleasure, choice or sexual autonomy.

Implications and argument for inclusion of sexuality into work on CEFM

As a consequence of the aforementioned reluctance to engage with sexuality, many individual actors in the CEFM field act within and reinforce patriarchal notions. Some programs view girls' sexuality as invisible and problematic. For example, a common consequence of CEFM is early childbearing, but CEFM programs do not always include comprehensive sexuality education or access to family planning or abortion services. Additionally, there is a disjuncture between the reality of girls' lives and the international narrative on CEFM. There is a need for the CEFM field to gain a more explicit understanding of the root causes of CEFM, including control of sexuality, from a gender perspective—making girls and their lived realities the basis of analysis and understanding regarding issues of sexuality. With this knowledge, solutions can improve girls' empowerment and autonomous decision making.

KEY PRINCIPLES FOR GUIDING WORK ON SEXUALITY IN THE CONTEXT OF CEFM

During the meeting, participants reached consensus about key guiding principles for incorporating interventions on sexuality into work addressing CEFM. Participants affirmed their commitment to strategically advance attention to sexuality in their work using these principles, outlined in detail below.

Work addressing CEFM should be gender transformative. Foremost, participants agreed to start their work with a gender lens, with the aim of developing gender transformative programs, policies and research agendas. They agreed the goal of CEFM work should be to develop truly empowering approaches for adolescents—with girls at the center of these approaches. These empowerment approaches should consider expression of sexuality to play a role in individual agency and link sexuality to the exercise of numerous other rights, which require both individual and structural shifts. For example, gender transformative approaches include attention to the conditions that promote sexual diversity and attempt to not reinforce heteronormativity.

Community/local norm change is key. Throughout the meeting, attention to the varied contexts of CEFM and the need for community-based approaches emerged as common principles. Funding at the local and community level creates opportunities to capture the voices of girls and empower them to advocate for their rights and to influence decisionmakers. Community-level work is also important for engaging key stakeholders like teachers and health professionals, who can have a powerful impact. Examples of successful work include programs that have partnered with existing, strong, community-based women's groups that already have the trust of the community and understand the nuanced local context. Additionally, it is important to start conversations with communities that are ready to engage with issues of sexuality and to use approaches that honor local experiences. Another successful program example used sports and general education as an avenue to start conversations about girls and their sexuality. Some programs address the basic needs of the community before introducing sexuality education curriculums. For example, the program might use nutrition and the right to food as a way to start a conversation on rights and autonomy, which can then lead the discussion into issues like sexual health and rights, with the theme of promotion and protection of the body connecting these topics together. Participants said it is important to frame the conditions for promotion of sexual rights and health within each local context, which may be diverse across different settings.

Sexuality is relational, requiring a holistic and intersectional approach. Participants felt strongly that a relational, holistic, ecological approach to understanding sexuality is important. In other words, it is important to understand sexuality as a phenomenon influenced by the state, communities, families and individuals. This means that any approach should be intersectional, involve all of these groups and prioritize cross-sectoral programs.

Sexuality should be seen as a positive part of human experience. Throughout the meeting, the principle of a positive approach to sexuality emerged. Participants thought sexuality should have a positive framing that views expressions of sexuality as a normal and important part of life. Within this framing, the group committed to support those who experience negative outcomes related to sexuality.

CHALLENGES AND POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS/APPROACHES TO ADDRESSING SEXUALITY

The group discussed the varied challenges to addressing sexuality, but also provided potential solutions and approaches based on their expertise and experience. The challenges listed below highlight issues raised in the larger group discussion and do not represent the breadth of small group conversations.

Cross-cutting programmatic challenges

One of the major programmatic challenges is **navigating the demands of religious forces** that promote abstinence-only approaches in order to find ways to advance an adolescent rights agenda. In order to address this, some programs in the Latin America and Caribbean region have compromised on language in an effort to find common ground upon which progressive and conservative groups can agree.

Another major challenge is the **lack of space to have reflective conversations around sexuality.** One potential approach that emerged from programmatic attendees working in the Asia Pacific region is to start from a feminist perspective to create safe spaces for these conversations. Participants said it is important to create resources, such as research evidence, and to solidify the rationale for conversations about sexuality before starting to speak with community leaders. The groups from the Asia Pacific region also advised: be prepared for backlash and be ready to mitigate it using ethical and honest reflection on the issues.

Additionally, the **normalization of violence has created a culture of silence** and exacerbated the hopelessness many feel. Participants said one key way to overcome this challenge is to incorporate holistic approaches that include multiple stakeholders (e.g. young boys as well as girls). All work should be dignity-focused and community-based. Some participants in Africa have seen success in this context using sexual pleasure as an entry point to discuss larger issues such as self-understanding.

Policy and advocacy challenges

Advocates have experienced **policymakers' aversion to discussing sexuality**, making it difficult to incorporate sexuality into policy at multiple levels. Participants said there is a need for credible spokespeople and champions around this issue, including adolescent girls, as well as research and evidence that can be used to inform policy advocacy. Advocacy efforts must remain context specific. Participants said one key approach is to continue educating policymakers on the centrality of sexuality to individuals' lives and development, and that talking points must also be developed to illustrate the relationship between patriarchy, power and sexuality.

Funding challenges

It is a challenge to fund work specifically related to sexuality given the **lack of a fully agreed-upon scope of work on sexuality and a deficit of commonly agreed-upon measures of success and impact**. This issue is only exacerbated by stigma and fear of the topic of sexuality, which can also restrict the willingness of funders to openly support work on the issue. Overcoming funder challenges requires bringing the voices of girls and community practitioners to funders in order to directly confront the reluctance of some donors to openly engage with the issue. While there are examples of such work funded by donors with young married women, the goal is to encourage donors to allow programs to address issues of patriarchy and sexuality and to support discussions about power within marriages—including the issue of sexuality—at the community and couple levels.

Research challenges

While there are many research gaps that are important to address, the main challenge is **to build a cycle of research and reflection that contributes to new insights into how control of female sexuality relates to other different drivers of CEFM** (e.g. poverty, cultural norms). The lack of research contributes to the under-conceptualization and lack of established indicator measures related to sexuality, mentioned above as a funding challenge. Research documenting successful sexuality programming—beyond comprehensive sexuality education—is also lacking among the actors focusing on CEFM. There is a need for more purposeful and continuous research designs in the international development context. In addition, sex-positive research is an important approach. For example, thinking about pleasure, orgasm and masturbation can lead to insights about larger issues of gender inequality, and these are

important markers of sexual health. A sex-positive research approach focuses on sexuality as normal and potentially positive life experience across the lifespan.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FIELD

Based on a reflection of best practices and characteristics of effective programs, the following recommendations arose.

Recommendations for program implementers

1: **Empower girls to be advocates for themselves and give young girls the skills needed to make changes possible.** Programming should center on gender transformative work with girls at the center. In order to reduce CEFM, it is imperative that program implementers investigate and generate alternative pathways so that girls and their families can refuse early marriage and not be at risk of sexual shaming and attacks. For some girls, the possibility of life outside of marriage may be unthinkable, and different pathways must be realistically explored. Additionally, many girls may experience backlash as they become more empowered and need help throughout this process. Girls of all ages should be included in programming. It is impossible to address issues of child marriage without examining the attitudes that underpin the perceived need to regulate girls' sexuality and push them into marriage.

2: **Involve women and men together in programming.** By bringing more people into a discussion about sexuality, we can learn from each other and think of new allies. Utilize gender synchronization—working strategically and intentionally with boys and girls, men and women to mutually reinforce—in an effort to create a supportive environment for young girls. It is not meaningful to look at girls' sexuality without also considering how boys' sexuality is constructed and how these relate to and interact with each other. Similarly, it is important to understand boys' marriage motivations. Part of this programming with adolescent boys and girls should address violence against children and women.

3: **Use an intergenerational approach.** This can mean promoting conversations and relationships across generations, as well as working with girls who are already married. The goal is to empower girls to better express their needs, wants and desires so that parents are better able to understand and value these aspects of their daughters. Intergenerational experiences can also facilitate a better understanding of the lives of women who are married and a broader understanding of the institution of marriage as a site of sexual expression and regulation. Approaches cannot only focus on prevention of early or forced marriage, but must address the needs of women currently married. Intergenerational approaches can also create a more supportive environment within the home where youth feel comfortable expressing themselves to parents.

4: **Build partnerships with communities and governments (bridging between state and national levels) to ensure sustainability.** Without community-led approaches that bring together multiple stakeholders, programs will not be successful. A key aspect of partnership building is developing trust and ensuring information gathered is not only accurate, but also created within a safe space. Additionally, there is a need to create messages that are appropriate across different levels and to be responsive to the differing needs of multiple stakeholder groups.

5: **Start at the beginning with trainings for staff, field and program officers.** The lack of conversations around sexuality is prevalent at every level, which has huge implications for the design of programs. It is important that programmers are trained and feel comfortable discussing these issues. A critical part of the trainings should include values clarification and leadership discussions.

6: **Use a multi-level, holistic approach to change.** Sexuality is a relational phenomenon based in power structures and cannot be addressed without involving individuals, families, communities and governments. Structural approaches to decrease gender inequality and increased sexual autonomy are important to pursue.

Recommendations for researchers

1: **More investment is needed to evaluate new measures and research questions.** This could include new research methodologies that incorporate participants, development of new, appropriate measures and the application of methodologies that are not only culturally appropriate but also locally centered. Feminist, community-based and participatory approaches, and multi-site research should be prioritized.

2: **Build an evidence base.** It is the responsibility of researchers, program leaders and funders to build a body of evidence. This evidence should include an examination of how patriarchy, sexuality, marriage and reproduction—and CEFM specifically—are built as social, institutional and individual practices. Sexuality research should remain positively focused and include outcomes such as sexual pleasure and masturbation, in addition to autonomy over decisions regarding one's body. The ability to seek pleasure may be a lens for understanding more difficult-to-measure issues and can act as a measure of agency. As we create knowledge, though, we must be critical of how this knowledge is used— by whom and for what ends. It is critical when incorporating sexuality to pay attention to the ethics of the programs and research we are building. There are important components that all research should include—concepts of power, informed decisionmaking and leadership skills development.

3: **Create a strong conceptual framework.** The links between sexuality, rights, autonomy, poverty, class, caste and marriage remain inexplicit in many contexts. The field would advance greatly with a clear conceptual framework regarding the overlap between these complex issues. This conceptual framework should not only focus on the individuals, but also seek to describe the ways in which communities and institutions determine and enforce social norms that govern sexuality for all persons, with particular attention to age and gender controls. Along with the conceptual framework, it is important to establish common measurements and create more robust definitions of success. Within CEFM work, it is important to prioritize indicators based on access to services and autonomous decisionmaking. The focus on age of marriage often ignores larger issues of gender inequality.

Recommendations for funders

1: **Prioritize multi-level programs.** Foundations should prioritize funding to multi-level programs (with collectives, communities and service provision at the local and regional levels) that address the relational aspect of sexuality.

2: **Recognize a long-term approach to sexuality programming.** It is important for funders to recognize the long-term nature of social change and be prepared to provide multi-year, flexible support to program implementers. We must broaden our framework of assessing work in an effort to redefine success and failure within the field. Progress should be measured based on the understanding that real, sustainable norms change takes time and does not always occur in a linear way.

Recommendations for advocates

1: **Present evidence and research on sexuality to policy makers.** Evidence can be very influential, and there is a need to take an evidence-based approach with successful examples of sexuality programming and its effects on CEFM, as well as other measures of young women's rights and health. Internationally, successful programs should be highlighted with policymakers.

2: **Create a mapping to better understand where there is potential for advocacy.** There is a need for credible spokespeople on the relationship between the control of sexuality and CEFM, and now is a key time to identify potential allies. Mapping areas of potential policy movement can help target advocacy efforts. Additionally, mapping current CEFM programs and current legal regulation approaches can help tighten advocacy arguments.

3: **Highlight issues of CEFM and sexuality within a broader framework of development.** For policy makers, it is important to connect CEFM work to the larger development goals and facilitate coordination across sectors. For example, there are connections between education and CEFM that need to be made more explicit. This is also true for human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and CEFM, as well as reproductive health and CEFM (e.g. the relations between obstetric fistula, early pregnancy and lack of access to appropriate services). A global discourse framing can open space for negotiations and collaborations across sectors.

4: **Empower girls to be advocates for themselves.** Encouraging girls to bring their messages to the public not only empowers these girls, but also is a powerful tool for impacting decisionmakers.

GAPS AND NEXT STEPS

By the end of the meeting, the focus was narrowed to the most pressing gaps, and the group decided on next steps. Programmatically, the overarching goal should be to document and disseminate best practices. The primary suggestion is a mapping of promising practices of gender transformative approaches that address sexuality within and outside of the context of CEFM. This information should be used by program implementers as a learning tool and by advocates as a way of opening dialogue with leaders and policymakers about how programming designed to address CEFM can examine the issue of sexuality.

From a research perspective, the overarching goal should be to develop and prioritize a research agenda based on providing evidence and articulating a conceptual framework that demonstrates the connection between patriarchal control of sexuality and CEFM at individual and institutional levels (micro, meso and macro scales of research). Research, as previously mentioned, should not only focus on the lives of young girls, but also attempt to better understand life within marriage and the role of marriage within the community and the state.

Finally, the global policy agenda should engage with advocates and others involved with CEFM around the upcoming UN General Assembly resolution and ensure that target 5.3 of the Sustainable Development Goals—to eliminate harmful practices such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilation/cutting—has effective gender equality indicators, and then ensure that is achieved. The objectives for this advocacy include: mapping a strong framework with appropriate language, mapping the events or moments where advocacy is needed and building capacity to increase the pool of advocates.

The ultimate goal of development work should be to ensure young people are flourishing and fulfilling their potential. The aim is that young people will be able to decide if, when and whom they marry. For those who do not wish to marry or wish to delay marriage, the goal is to ensure there are viable alternative paths and that they have the ability to choose what is right for them. For those who do wish to marry, the goal is to ensure that marriage is a safe place where each individual continues to have autonomous decisionmaking power in order to fulfill their desires.

APPENDIX

EXPERT WORKING MEETING ON
SEXUALITY AND CHILD, EARLY AND FORCED MARRIAGE

Meeting Location

Open Society Foundations, 224 W 57th St, New York, NY 10019

Meeting Objectives

1. Establish a common framework for understanding sexuality as a central driver of Child, Early and Forced Marriage (CEFM) and discuss why sexuality is traditionally missing from the CEFM discourse.

2. Discuss challenges and capacity-building needs in addressing sexuality in the context of CEFM.

3. Share concrete examples of diverse, culturally-specific, age-appropriate, and effective or promising right-based programming on sexuality at multiple levels (i.e. political, global, national, community).

4. Develop recommendations for addressing sexuality within the context of CEFM, including programmatic, research and advocacy gaps.

Facilitated by Alison Peters, Entrellis, and Margo Mullinax, Columbia University and American Jewish World Service.

AGENDA ITEMS

TUESDAY MARCH 8TH 2016: DAY 1

Time	Session	Objective
8:30am-9:30am	Registration and Breakfast	
9:30am-9:45am	**Opening welcome**, Jacqueline Hart, *American Jewish World Service* **Introduction and agenda overview** Alison Peters *(Facilitator)*	
9:45am-10:45am	Ice breaker	
10:45am-12:45pm	**Sexuality as a central driver of CEFM** Meg Greene, *GreeneWorks* Jacqueline Hart, *American Jewish World Service* Opening presentation exploring a common framework for understanding sexuality in the context of CEFM.	1
12:45pm-1:45pm	Lunch	
1:45pm-3:15pm	**What are the challenges in addressing sexuality in the context of CEFM?** Facilitated discussion focusing on challenges faced in addressing sexuality in CEFM programs, policy/advocacy and research.	2
3:15pm-3:30pm	Coffee and Tea Break	
3:30pm-5:00pm	**How do we incorporate sexuality in CEFM programs, policy/advocacy and research?** Qadeer Baig, *Rutgers WPF-Pakistan* Giovanna Lauro, *Promundo* Helena Minchew, *International Women's Health Coalition* Interactive panel discussion about concrete examples of diverse, culturally-specific approaches to addressing sexuality in the context of CEFM.	3
5:00pm-5:15pm	Closing	

WEDNESDAY MARCH 9TH 2016: DAY 2

Time	Session	Objective
8:30am-9:30am	Breakfast	
9:30am-10:00am	Daily Opening and Ice Breaker	
10:00am-11:45am	**How do we incorporate sexuality in CEFM programs, policy/advocacy and research? (continued)** Rupsa Mallik, *CREA* Alejandra Colom, *Population Council (Guatemala)* Dorothy Aken'Ova, *INCRESE* Interactive panel discussion about concrete examples of diverse, culturally-specific approaches to addressing sexuality in the context of CEFM.	3
11:45am-12:00pm	Coffee and Tea Break	
12:00pm-1:00pm	**What are the gaps?** Breakout groups exploring current gaps in incorporating sexuality in CEFM programs, policy/advocacy and research.	2, 3
1:00pm-2:00pm	Lunch	
2:00pm-5:00pm	**How do we move the conversation forward?** Closing session to develop recommendations and next steps for addressing sexuality within the context of CEFM programs, policy/advocacy and research.	4

Event organizers

PARTICIPANTS

Co-Organizers:

1. Amanda Hariton, American Jewish World Service
2. Dave Scamell, American Jewish World Service
3. Doris Bartel, CARE
4. Helena (Lena) Minchew, International Women's Health Coalition
5. Jacqueline Hart, American Jewish World Service
6. Margaret Greene, GreeneWorks
7. Margo Mullinax, Columbia University and American Jewish World Service (Facilitator)
8. Milkah Kihunah, CARE
9. Nidal Karim, CARE
10. Stephanie Perlson, GreeneWorks
11. Alison Peters, Entrellis (Facilitator)

Participants:

1. Alejandra Colom, Population Council, Guatemala
2. Alex Munive, Plan International
3. Alexandra Spiess, Global Affairs Canada
4. Alice Miller, Yale Law School
5. Archana Dwivedi, Nirantar
6. Brad Kerner, Save the Children
7. Dorothy Aken'Ova, International Center for Reproductive Health and Rights (INCREASE)
8. Elisa Slattery, Open Society Foundations
9. Elizabeth Sully, Guttmacher Institute
10. Ellen Travers, Girls Not Brides
11. Erin Murphy Graham, University of California, Berkeley
12. Esther Wambui Kilmani, Young Women's Leadership Institute
13. Giovanna Lauro, Promundo
14. Gwyn Hainsworth, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
15. Ingrid Galvez, GO Joven, Guatemala
16. Javid Syed, American Jewish World Service
17. Jeffery Edmeades, International Center for Research on Women
18. Jennifer Parsons, American Jewish World Service
19. Joya Taft-Dick, Tostan
20. Linda Sussman, United States Agency for International Development
21. May-I Fabros, RESURJ
22. Madhu Mehra, Partners for Law in Development
23. Michal Avni, United States Agency for International Development
24. Nyaradzayi Gumbonzvanda, World YWCA
25. PeiYao Chen, Global Fund for Women and AmplifyChange
26. Priya Nanda, International Center for Research on Women, India
27. Qadeer Baig, Rutgers WPF, Pakistan
28. Rupsa Mallik, CREA
29. Satvika Chalasani, United Nations Population Fund
30. Susan Wood, International Women's Health Coalition
31. Tanya Khokhar, Ford Foundation