



# WOMEN AT THE TABLE

OHCHR Submission: Peace and International Solidarity Through Community Authority

A Proposal for Integrated Peace Intelligence Infrastructure November 5, 2025

---

## Who We Are

This submission comes from organizations developing Parity and Peace Intelligence (PPI), a proposed federated data infrastructure designed to make community peace work visible, resourced, and structurally embedded in policy. We write as researchers and practitioners partnering with women's networks and peacebuilding organizations who consistently report that current systems fail to capture or support the work that actually sustains peace.

---

## The Central Problem

The sixteen questions reveal an assumption: peace is what states do through laws, programs, and international forums. But in every conflict zone, communities sustain peace through work current systems don't measure, fund, or protect:

- Local mediation preventing violence from escalating
- Women's economic networks providing resilience when aid fails
- Community early warning that sees patterns official systems miss
- Care work keeping families intact through displacement

This work is structurally invisible. When it collapses, so does peace—but no data system connects the dots.

Meanwhile, digital infrastructure increasingly determines who gets aid, whose security threats count, which narratives shape policy, and whose organizing becomes visible or vulnerable. Communities doing peace work have no authority over these systems.

The gap: Peace frameworks address what states and international organizations do. They don't address the infrastructure communities need to sustain peace—or give communities power over the digital systems now mediating their work.

**Context:** This submission reflects analysis from organizations developing data infrastructure to support community peace work, drawing on partnerships with women's networks and peacebuilding organizations across conflict-affected regions.

---

## **Q1: Are there constitutional provisions or legal frameworks addressing the right to peace? Is it justiciable?**

### **Answer:**

Many constitutions recognize peace as a right—Colombia's 2016 peace accord includes gender provisions, Kenya's 2010 constitution mandates equality, numerous constitutions reference peaceful dispute resolution. However, these frameworks face a critical limitation: they don't extend to the digital systems increasingly determining peace outcomes.

**The justiciability gap:** Communities cannot currently challenge platform business models that profit from amplifying division in conflict zones, algorithmic resource allocation that systematically bypasses community peace infrastructure, or digital systems that make women peacebuilders' organizing impossible through harassment and surveillance.

Constitutional peace rights remain largely unenforceable against the transnational tech infrastructure now mediating community organizing, aid distribution, and public discourse in conflict zones.

**Our proposal (PPI):** Create evidentiary infrastructure enabling communities to document digital harms to peace work—extending justiciability of peace rights to platform accountability and algorithmic governance.

---

## **Q2: How do countries promote negative peace (absence of violence/war)?**

### **Answer:**

States typically report: early warning systems, peacekeeping operations, ceasefire monitoring, border security, conflict prevention programs.

**The structural problem:** These systems operate separately from community knowledge. Communities consistently report seeing violence coming—noticing harassment patterns targeting local organizers, economic pressures building, warning signs they've observed before previous violence—yet having no mechanism to make their pattern recognition trigger official response until crisis erupts.

**What would actually promote negative peace:**

Countries should create infrastructure where:

- **Community early warning feeds official response systems** (not after-the-fact reporting)
- **Digital platforms face accountability** for documented amplification of violence in conflict zones
- **Resources flow to proven community prevention work** (mediation networks, women's cooperatives, local dialogue mechanisms)

**The PPI approach:** Integrate community-documented patterns with official conflict data, enabling preventive action based on ground-level intelligence rather than only reacting to escalated violence.

---

**Q3: Do countries utilize peaceful dispute resolution for territorial/other disputes?**

**Answer:**

Most countries have formal mechanisms: international arbitration, bilateral negotiation, regional frameworks. However, the most effective dispute resolution happens at community level and remains structurally invisible.

**Community reality:** The grandmother who mediates between families after violence. The women's council facilitating dialogue after land disputes. The elders negotiating before conflicts escalate. These processes resolve the majority of disputes but receive no recognition, resources, or protection.

**The disconnect:** Formal systems get billions while community mechanisms that actually work go unfunded. Then when community infrastructure collapses from lack of support, violence erupts and reports say "dispute resolution failed"—without acknowledging why.

**What's needed:** Documentation methodologies showing community mediation outcomes, enabling resource allocation based on proven impact rather than institutional assumptions about what "legitimate" dispute resolution looks like.

---

#### **Q4: Have countries expressed international solidarity for peace with other countries?**

**Answer:**

States express solidarity through: peacekeeping contributions, humanitarian aid, diplomatic support, regional security frameworks.

**The missing infrastructure:** Countries lack mechanisms for community-to-community solidarity that transcends state mediation. Women's networks across East Africa share violence prevention strategies. Colombian and Filipino peacebuilders learn from each other's organizing approaches. Yet no infrastructure enables this knowledge to inform official solidarity actions.

**What international solidarity requires:**

Federated data architecture where:

- Communities share pattern recognition across borders (this harassment sequence preceded violence in Region A, now appearing in Region B)
- Regional bodies (AU, ASEAN, OAS) coordinate based on community documentation
- Resources flow through proven community networks rather than only state-to-state channels

**PPI proposal:** Enable solidarity as shared early warning and coordinated protection, governed by communities doing peace work rather than only by states monitoring it.

---

#### **Q5: How do countries promote positive peace (equality, non-discrimination, elimination of structural violence)?**

**Answer:**

Countries report: gender ministries, anti-discrimination laws, social justice programs, structural reform initiatives.

**The gap communities identify:**

Gender ministries often lack budget and cannot require other ministries to integrate equality analysis. Digital transformation programs—increasingly determining economic opportunity—proceed without equality frameworks. AI systems allocating reconstruction resources encode biases toward male-led, urban, government-connected organizations.

**The structural violence no one measures:**

- Care work sustaining communities through conflict rendered invisible in economic data
- Community organizing preventing violence going unrecognized and unfunded
- Women's mediation networks resolving disputes but bypassed in official processes
- Digital platforms profiting from division while community cohesion work receives nothing

**What promoting positive peace requires:**

Infrastructure making structural patterns visible:

- How excluding women from digital governance correlates with peace process failure
  - Where algorithmic resource allocation perpetuates inequality
  - Which community structures actually create lasting cohesion (and resourcing them)
  - How platform business models constitute structural violence (and regulating them)
- 

**Q6: Do countries support culture of peace through peace education?****Answer:**

Many countries have peace education curricula covering non-violence, tolerance, intercultural dialogue, and gender equality.

**The limitation:** These programs often ignore where the most sophisticated peace knowledge exists—in communities that have survived violence and rebuilt.

**Community peace education that's not captured:**

- Grandmothers in Rwanda teaching reconciliation methodologies they developed post-genocide
- Colombian women's networks transmitting economic survival strategies through displacement
- Palestinian mothers teaching children how to maintain dignity and humanity
- Youth in conflict zones developing collective digital security strategies

#### **What peace education now requires:**

- **Documentation** of community methodologies using participatory approaches
- **Cross-regional learning** infrastructure where communities share strategies
- **Digital sovereignty curricula** (how to protect organizing, govern platforms, read data for power)
- **Resources flowing to knowledge-holders** in communities, not only external experts

Peace education must address the systems now mediating power—including digital infrastructure—or it prepares young people for a world that no longer exists.

---

#### **Q7: Do countries apply peaceful resolution mechanisms for labor disputes?**

##### **Answer:**

Most countries have labor arbitration, collective bargaining frameworks, and dispute resolution mechanisms for formal employment.

**The invisible labor dispute frontier:** Digital platform work—content moderation, gig economy, data annotation—increasingly involves workers in conflict-affected regions exposed to:

- Traumatic content (moderators reviewing violence)
- Algorithmic wage determination with no transparency
- Transnational power asymmetries (workers in Global South, platforms in Global North)
- No dispute resolution mechanisms when algorithms cause harm

**The peace connection:** When platform labor disputes have no resolution pathways, they destabilize communities. When content moderators in conflict zones have no support for trauma exposure, it perpetuates harm. When algorithmic management suppresses worker organizing, it undermines community cohesion.

**What's needed:** Dispute resolution frameworks extending to digital labor, with transnational coordination since platforms operate across borders.

---

**Q8: Do countries engage in ending cultural violence (hate speech, xenophobia, discrimination) with civil society?**

**Answer:**

Many countries have hate speech laws and collaborate with civil society on monitoring and counter-speech programs.

**The systemic failure:** National laws cannot address transnational platforms whose business models profit from amplifying division. Content moderation policies are inconsistent and slow. Meanwhile, algorithmic amplification ensures outrage spreads faster than nuance, dehumanization gets more engagement than humanization.

**Community experience:** Civil society documents hate speech, provides counter-narratives, reports violations—but cannot counter systemic amplification with individual speech. The infrastructure itself requires accountability.

**What collaboration should enable:**

- **Community documentation** of how platform features enable targeting (feeds accountability demands)
- **Coordinated regional action** when harassment patterns cross borders
- **Platform regulation** based on civil society evidence of documented harms
- **Resources for community-owned alternatives** (cooperative platforms, community-governed moderation)

The fight isn't just against hate speech content—it's for authority over the infrastructure that amplifies or suppresses it.

---

**Q9: Do countries promote women's engagement in peace and protection from violence?**

**Answer:**

Most countries have National Action Plans on Women, Peace and Security (per UNSCR 1325), programs supporting women in peace processes, and gender-based violence prevention initiatives.

### **The representation vs. power gap:**

Current approaches count women at negotiating tables but not:

- Whether they control reconstruction budgets
- Whether they own equity in digital infrastructure
- Whether their organizing power (not just presence) is resourced
- Whether harassment targeting them predicts broader instability

**Protection's blind spot:** Programs focus on physical security but not the digital infrastructure increasingly determining whose organizing succeeds. Women peacebuilders report:

- Harassment on platforms with no accountability
- Algorithmic aid allocation bypassing women-led networks
- Data systems rendering their contributions invisible
- Surveillance making transnational solidarity dangerous

**What's needed:** Protection extending to governance authority over digital systems, economic power beyond representation, and recognition that excluding women from platform ownership undermines peace infrastructure.

---

## **Q10: Does civil society promote solidarity for negative and positive peace?**

**Answer:**

**Yes, extensively.** Civil society organizations:

### **For negative peace:**

- Facilitate community mediation preventing violence escalation
- Provide early warning based on ground-level pattern recognition
- Document violations and bear witness
- Create spaces for dialogue across divided groups

### **For positive peace:**

- Organize economic cooperatives providing resilience



- Challenge structural discrimination through advocacy
- Build alternative institutions when state systems fail
- Transmit knowledge about how communities survived violence

**The infrastructure gap:** This work is happening but structurally invisible. No data systems capture community organizing capacity. No funding mechanisms resource based on documented outcomes. No governance structures give community knowledge decision-making authority.

**What PPI proposes:** Infrastructure making civil society peace work visible, protected, and resourced—shifting from testimony about needs to authority based on evidence.

---

## **Q11: Is civil society subject to cultural violence for peace activism?**

**Answer:**

**Yes, systematically.** Civil society actors promoting peace face:

**Online harassment:** Coordinated campaigns targeting women organizers, doxxing, threats circulated on platforms with no accountability.

**Delegitimization:** Accusations of being "foreign agents," "politically biased," or "terrorist sympathizers" for facilitating dialogue or expressing solidarity.

**Narrative suppression:** Algorithms that amplify hate speech and violence but suppress peace organizing and dialogue.

**The gendered dimension:** Women peace activists face specific targeting—gendered attacks, sexualized harassment, threats against family members—designed to silence their organizing.

**The accountability gap:** Platforms profit from this targeting while providing no recourse. States with hate speech laws can't regulate transnational infrastructure. Civil society organizations document harms but cannot challenge the systems enabling them.

---

## **Q12-13: Can civil society participate in international solidarity without penalization? Are they subject to surveillance?**

**Answer:**

**Increasingly, no.** Civil society organizations expressing transnational solidarity face:

**Legal restrictions:**

- "Foreign agent" laws criminalizing international funding or coordination
- Counter-terrorism legislation applied to solidarity with movements elsewhere
- Surveillance of transnational communications and organizing

**Financial constraints:**

- Banks refusing transfers to organizations in conflict zones
- Donor restrictions on "political" activity (defined as challenging power structures)
- Resource denial when organizing crosses borders

**Digital surveillance:**

- State monitoring of encrypted communications
- Platform data sharing with security services
- Algorithmic flagging of transnational organizing as suspicious

**The contradiction:** States claim to support international solidarity while restricting civil society's ability to practice it. Communities that have survived similar violence cannot safely share strategies across borders.

**What's needed:** Recognition that transnational organizing sustains peace, not threatens it. Protection for cross-border solidarity as peace infrastructure. Federated data architecture enabling community learning without state or corporate surveillance.

---

**Q14: Please provide examples of programs addressing intersectional peace issues (nuclear disarmament, environment, refugees, etc.)**

**Answer:**

**The fragmentation problem:** Most programs address issues in silos—nuclear disarmament separately from gender equality, environmental protection separately from peace, refugee rights separately from digital governance.

**Community reality reveals integration:**

- Women protecting Amazon forests face violence specifically against women leaders (environment + gender + peace)
- Refugee protection involves algorithmic asylum systems encoding gender bias (digital + gender + forced migration)
- Nuclear disarmament movements find women organizers face identical digital harassment globally (peace + gender + digital infrastructure)

### **What integration would enable (PPI proposal):**

Connecting peace data, parity data, digital governance data, environmental data, economic data (including care work) reveals patterns:

- Where harassment of women environmental defenders precedes violence (enabling prevention)
- How algorithmic border systems create vulnerability (enabling accountability)
- Which organizing structures sustain communities across crises (enabling resourcing)

### **Example of how this would work:**

Machine learning identifies that in six regions, increased targeting of women land defenders preceded conflict escalation by 60-90 days. This pattern enables:

- Early warning triggering protection protocols
- Regional coordination of rapid response
- Platform accountability for documented amplification
- Resource flows to proven protection strategies

The data exists. What's missing is integration and community authority over interpretation.

## **Q15: Are civil society organizations inclusive of women asserting freedom from violence (including structural violence)?**

**Answer:**

### **Mixed reality:**

Many civil society organizations center women's leadership and explicitly address structural violence—economic exclusion, algorithmic discrimination, platform-enabled harassment.

However, even well-intentioned organizations often:

- Consult women rather than ceding governance authority
- Focus on women as victims rather than agents
- Address physical violence but ignore digital infrastructure threats
- Measure representation without tracking resource control

**What inclusivity requires:**

- **Women as builders and owners** of peace infrastructure (not beneficiaries or stakeholders)
- **Governance power** over data, platforms, and resources
- **Structural violence made visible** (algorithmic discrimination, economic data rendering care work invisible, platform business models)
- **Protection extending to digital domain** (not only physical security)

**The PPI approach:** Governance model co-led by women's rights and digital justice organizations, with women's networks as data co-stewards holding decision-making authority—not just advisory roles.

---

**Q16: How does civil society contribute to peace education and culture of peace?**

**Answer:**

Civil society provides the most grounded peace education:

**Direct transmission:**

- Women who survived genocide teaching reconciliation
- Community organizers sharing violence prevention strategies
- Youth developing digital security for organizing
- Elders transmitting knowledge of maintaining dignity through crisis

**Counter-narrative work:**

- Challenging hate speech with community stories
- Documenting truth when official narratives erase violence
- Creating spaces for dialogue platforms won't support
- Building alternative media when corporate media amplifies division

## **Intergenerational knowledge transfer:**

- Connecting elders' pattern recognition with youth's digital fluency
- Documenting community methodologies for cross-regional learning
- Creating curricula reflecting lived experience, not external assumptions

**The resource gap:** This education happens despite, not because of, structural support. Communities doing sophisticated peace work receive minimal resources while formal programs with less community grounding receive millions.

**What's needed:** Infrastructure enabling civil society peace educators to document their methodologies, share across regions, and receive resources based on documented impact.

---

## **Q17: Do UN/intergovernmental organizations provide adequate forums for solidarity and peace expression?**

**Answer:**

**No—for three structural reasons:**

### **1. Expression without infrastructure for action**

Current model:

- Communities testify → Officials acknowledge → Policy proceeds unchanged

Communities need:

- Documentation infrastructure → Evidence triggers mechanisms → Policy must respond

### **2. Extraction without authority**

Forums currently:

- Extract community knowledge
- Use it to inform policy designed elsewhere
- Don't give communities governance power over systems affecting them

### **3. No protection from retaliation**

When participating in international forums leads to targeting:

- Platforms provide no accountability for subsequent harassment
- States offer no rapid response protection
- Communities face consequences for visibility with no structural support

**What adequate forums require:**

- **Real-time data access** for communities (not annual reports they can't access)
- **Participatory governance** over monitoring systems (not just consultation)
- **Binding accountability** (when community evidence shows system failures, mechanisms respond)
- **Protection infrastructure** (rapid response when solidarity expression brings targeting)
- **Resource flows following evidence** (budgets adapt based on community-documented impact)

**The PPI proposal:** Federated architecture enabling forums to become accountable to community knowledge rather than just consuming testimony from it.

---

## Cross-Cutting Conclusion

These sixteen questions reveal a consistent pattern: **Peace frameworks address what states and international organizations do. They don't provide infrastructure for what communities need to sustain peace—or give communities authority over the systems now mediating their work.**

**The proposal:**

**Parity and Peace Intelligence** creates federated, community-governed data infrastructure connecting existing datasets across peace, parity, and digital domains. This enables:

1. **Community knowledge to become policy evidence** (not just testimony)
2. **Early warning from ground level** to trigger preventive action
3. **Resource allocation based on documented outcomes** (what actually works)
4. **Platform and algorithmic accountability** (when digital systems undermine peace infrastructure)
5. **Transnational solidarity** (communities learning across borders)
6. **Women's governance authority** (over systems affecting their communities)

**70% of needed data exists in open repositories** (UN Women, ACLED, UCDP, ITU, OECD, World Bank). The gap is integration and community authority over interpretation.

**International solidarity for peace requires:** Building infrastructure that makes community authority possible—not just creating more forums for communities to testify in systems that don't respond to their evidence.

---