



Equal and Inclusive Representation of LGBTI Women in Decision-Making Systems

Written submission to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women for their Draft General Recommendation No. 40 on Equal and Inclusive Representation of Women in Decision-Making Systems

18 April 2024

Methodology

This submission presents the results of a series of collective discussions organised by ILGA World¹ in response to the call for submissions by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (hereinafter, 'the Committee,' 'CEDAW,' or 'the CEDAW Committee') regarding their [Draft General Recommendation No. 40: Equal and Inclusive Representation of Women in Decision-Making Systems](#) (hereinafter, 'the Draft'). Over **30 civil society organisations** and **60 human rights defenders** from all regions participated in these discussions and shared their local, regional, and international expertise on the matter.²

¹ ILGA World, <https://ilga.org>, established in 1978, is a federation of more than 1900 organisations from over 160 countries and territories campaigning for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex (LGBTI) human rights. ILGA World enjoys the ECOSOC status, consistently engaging with United Nations human rights bodies, and conducts legal and socio-economic research on the situation of LGBTI persons. ILGA World supports local LGBTI civil society groups engaging with United Nations Treaty Bodies, Special Procedures and the Human Rights Council.

² Blue Diamond Society (Nepal), Visibles (Guatemala), Más Igualdad (Peru), Tamara Adrián (Venezuela), Sher Vancouver (Canada), WE-Change Jamaica (Jamaica), Ontario Federation of

The dialogues focused on the different contents of the Draft, with a particular focus on the following:

- LGBTI women's equal right to participate in decision-making (in relation to section III. A. of the Draft).
- Gender parity and intersectional participation in decision-making (in relation to section III. B. of the Draft).
- Structural transformation of equal and inclusive decision-making systems (section IV. E. of the Draft).
- Civil society participation in decision-making systems (section V. B. of the Draft).

A. In relation to section III. A. of the Draft: LGBTI women's equal right to participate in decision-making

Towards inclusive representation of LGBTI women in decision-making

The concept of 'women' or 'womanhood' is often predominantly heterosexual, binarised, and cisnormative,³ stemming from societal binaries and patriarchal norms. This narrow perspective disregards the diverse identities and experiences of women, perpetuating an essentialist notion of womanhood. Traditional portrayals of women as solely heterosexual and

Labour (Canada), Rainbow Railroad (Canada), United and Strong (St. Lucia), 758 Pride (St. Lucia), Lauren Levitt (United States), Coalition Margins (North Macedonia), AMIGAY Aps (Italy), Fédération Prisme (Belgium), International Centre for Total Health and Rights Advocacy Empowerment (Nigeria), Manodiversa (Bolivia), Colectivo TLGB (Bolivia), Fundación Arcoíris (Mexico), Rainbow Ignite (Serbia), Invictus Health (Australia), Fundación Mujer & Mujer (Ecuador), Just Institutions at One Future Collective (India), Agente Diversa (Chile), Promsex (Peru), Mitini (Nepal), Equal Post Ost (Germany), Youth Health and Right Initiative for Advocacy and Empowerment (Nigeria), ASKE MW Organization (Malawi), Myriad Kofkin Global (Australia), PEMA (Kenya), COMCAVIS Trans (El Salvador), Social Policy, Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation Studies Association (SPoD) (Turkey), The Advocates for Human Rights (USA), and Estonian LGBT Association (Estonia).

* Not all civil society organisations and human rights defenders that participated in the discussions have been included in this list due to security and safety concerns, and possible reprisals.

The collective discussions were organised with the support of ILGA LAC, ILGA PAI, ILGA NAC, ILGA Oceania, ILGA Europe, and ILGA Asia.

³ **Cisnormativity** is understood as “The expectation that all people are cisgender, that those assigned male at birth always grow up to be men and those assigned female at birth always grow up to be women.” See: Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, “Basic concepts” <<https://www.oas.org/en/iachr/multimedia/2015/lgbti-violence/lgbti-terminology.html>>.

cisgender,⁴ and as motherly figures, confined to a certain age, class, race, and occupational roles, is detrimental and undermines the richness and complexity of their lived experiences.

To address this, the CEDAW Committee should take a stronger stance, challenging the gender stereotype of women as primarily caregivers and homemakers. Furthermore, the Committee should explicitly acknowledge and prioritise the representation of underrepresented women, encompassing diverse identities such as those of LGBTI women, from the outset of the General Recommendation. This approach should serve as **both a theoretical and a practical lens through which to understand and implement General Recommendation No. 40.**

Instead of relegating the diversity of women to a section of the instrument, the Committee must transcend essentialism, ensuring that women, in their full spectrum of identities, are comprehensively integrated from the outset and throughout the entirety of General Recommendation No. 40. The Committee should **provide an understanding of 'women' through a framework for the entirety of the General Recommendation that is inclusive of LGBTI women**, enabling the instrument to be read systemically in a manner that embraces diverse and intersectional identities.

B. In relation to section III. B. of the Draft: Gender parity and intersectional participation in decision-making

The pursuit of gender parity in political participation cannot be separated from broader struggles for economic, racial, and **other forms of parity**. Recognising their interconnectedness is crucial, and the Committee's focus in the future General Recommendation should **reflect this holistic approach, rather than isolating one form of parity—namely, gender parity—in a vacuum**. Intersectionality provides an essential framework through which to understand the complex interplay of various forms of oppression within and across decision-making systems. **It extends beyond mere quotas for participation, serving as a lens to examine how women's intersecting identities impact their experiences in regards to and within decision-making systems.**

Additionally, there is a **pressing need for an intersectional framework that addresses parity while also considering differentials**: Social constructs must be viewed in their entirety in decision-making processes, or access to decision-making systems will be limited. **Participation quotas must transcend binary notions of gender** and embrace the inclusivity of all intersections, including those of LGBTI women. Moreover, if LGBTI women obtain a job or position at a public institution through participation quotas, this access does not guarantee job security, physical security, protection, and respect of their dignity. In the case of trans

⁴ A **cisgender person** is “When the gender identity of the person corresponds with the sex assigned at birth. The “cis” prefix is antonym of the “trans” prefix.” See: Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, “Basic concepts” <<https://www.oas.org/en/iachr/multimedia/2015/lgbti-violence/lgbti-terminology.html>>.

women, their pronouns are often disrespected in the public arena, and their work contracts are drafted with their legal name rather than the name they identify with.

In addition, **electoral processes are moments when discrimination and backlash against LGBTI women, especially trans women, are most pronounced.** Particularly in these situations, LGBTI women need to factor in protection and security when considering participating in decision-making systems. When trans women enter decision-making systems, it is often mandatory for them to disclose their gender identity to the public, exposing them to discrimination and various forms of violence. Even when discrimination during electoral processes is reported through legal avenues, the sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics (hereinafter, 'SOGIESC') of LGBTI women are often disrespected and disregarded.

In Peru, a 'Protocol to guarantee the right of trans and non-binary persons to vote'⁵ was established. It included guidelines for electoral actors participating on election day and for interacting with citizens inside polling places. Peru seeks to eliminate the obstacles faced by trans persons on election day, as during these electoral processes they face discrimination on the basis of their SOGIESC. **The risk of discrimination is such that they may prefer not to participate in these processes, especially in voting spaces.**⁶ This protocol aims to guarantee the trans vote, ensuring that trans women are not discriminated against based on the picture, gender, and/or name on their identity card.

Despite legislative changes in some states towards the inclusion of LGBTI women in decision-making systems through quotas, the *de facto* impact of policy remains limited, highlighting the **disparity between legal frameworks and tangible outcomes, known as a situation of 'political fiction.'** The adoption and implementation of parity laws that require alternation often fall short of enhancing the quality of representation or fostering internal reflection on gender equality, diversity inclusion, and political participation of LGBTI women.

⁵ Oficina Nacional de Procesos Electorales, "Protocolo para Garantizar el derecho al voto de las personas trans y no-binarias en la jornada electoral" (2022) <<https://www.gob.pe/institucion/onpe/informes-publicaciones/3559755-protocolo-para-garantizar-el-derecho-al-voto-de-las-personas-trans-y-no-binarias-en-la-jornada-electoral>>. See also: Registraduría Nacional del Estado Civil Colombia, "Protocolo para la Atención de las Personas Trans" <https://www.registraduria.gov.co/IMG/pdf/20231029_trato-personas-trans.pdf>; Misión de Observación Electoral, "Protocolo para promover medidas que garanticen el derecho al voto de las personas trans (transgénero, transexuales y travestis) en igualdad de condiciones y libre de discriminación" (2020) <<https://www.moe.org.co/protocolo-para-promover-medidas-que-garanticen-el-derecho-al-voto-de-las-personas-trans-transgenero-transexuales-y-travestis-en-igualdad-de-condiciones-y-libre-de-discriminacion/>>.

⁶ *ibid.*

C. Section IV. E. of the draft: Structural transformation of equal and inclusive decision-making systems

A structural transformation in the approach to decision-making systems is imperative to ensure the inclusion of LGBTI women. They should not merely be present as attendees but actively engaged in every step of governance structures, programming, and decision-making processes.

In many states, the **absence of anti-discrimination laws** or their poor enforcement, coupled with the **criminalisation of diverse identities**, perpetuates systemic discrimination against LGBTI women. This hindrance affects their access and participation in political representation, and signifies a higher exposure to discrimination based on their SOGIESC. **The criminalisation of LGBTI identities poses a severe threat to political participation**, with LGBTI women facing discrimination and even **the risk of the death penalty** if they assert their identities within or outside decision-making systems.

Decision-making systems, rooted in heteropatriarchal and heterosexist perspectives and norms, predominantly reflect male-centric governance structures, lacking intersectional participation and perpetuating the invisibilisation of LGBTI women. **The participation of LGBTI women in decision-making systems does not necessarily translate into a greater capacity to influence public agendas**, especially in the context of corrupt governments. Additionally, **the political participation of LGBTI women is rather sporadic**, lacking the ability to engage in subsequent articulated efforts.

Tokenism of LGBTI identities as a barrier to structural transformation of decision-making systems

Tokenism remains a prevalent issue within political parties, enterprises, women's organisations, and all decision-making arenas, where **LGBTI identities are co-opted for symbolic inclusion without substantive involvement**. LGBTI women are placed in positions of 'diversity' solely to accommodate and showcase 'inclusion' or to 'tick a box,' maintaining appearances for institutions, both public and private. This phenomenon can also be part of **rainbow-washing and pink-washing campaigns**. For instance, political parties tokenise LGBTI identities to gain power during elections and advance their own interests, but these identities are often excluded from actual decision-making processes during the governmental period. This tendency is particularly perpetrated against LGBTI women from the Global South, who are often relegated to performative roles lacking transformative impact beyond tokenistic features. Moreover, once political parties are in power, they may **scapegoat LGBTI women for various issues**.

Socioeconomic conditions of LGBTI women and their relation to their access to decision-making systems

The intersectional realities faced by LGBTI women underscore the need for structural and transformative approaches to political participation and decision-making systems. Prevailing narratives within CEDAW's Draft fail to **acknowledge the socioeconomic preconditions essential for the empowerment and expansion of women's and LGBTI rights organisations.** Issues such as food security, climate justice, safety, physical, and mental health are integral to the existence and effective functioning of these organisations, yet they often go unaddressed, hindering their capacity to advocate for human rights and participate in decision-making systems.

Furthermore, the general **socioeconomic situation of LGBTI women is a structural barrier to their access to decision-making systems.** Economic empowerment through access to economic opportunities and targeted policies is fundamental to addressing the socioeconomic disparities faced by LGBTI women at a political level and to being able to represent oneself and one's community.

It is **challenging for LGBTI women to access formal and high-level political participation,** and instead, they often find themselves participating solely at a grassroots level. This is often due to the structural discrimination inherent in being part of LGBTI communities and embodying other intersections, which prevent LGBTI women from accessing decision-making systems or accessing them on equal terms as their male, and heterosexual peers.⁷ Even if LGBTI women manage to 'get into the room' or secure a 'seat at the decision-making table,' they do not necessarily do so on equal terms with their male peers.⁸ At times, their advocacy is relegated to gender-based roles or gender issues, rather than participating in 'male dominated' industries. **In many cases, accessing political participation presupposes hiding one's non-heterosexual identity and conforming to heteronormativity,⁹ or disclosing one's LGBTI identity but suffering the consequences.**

⁷ In Ecuador, political participation of LGBTI candidacies has been decreasing in recent years, particularly given the current political and social context. There were 17 LGBTI candidacies in the previous elections, and none in the upcoming elections. Moreover, LGBTI candidates are usually invisibilized, and they often do not take a position on LGBTI issues. Candidates who enter into politics often 'go back into the closet' after a while, as the public knowledge about their SOGIESC poses a threat to their security through threats, enforced disappearances, fear, hitmen, kidnappings, and assassinations. Discrimination against trans and lesbian women is widespread across all social media platforms. In other cases, LGBTI candidates who access decision-making roles are forcibly 'outed' by other politicians.

⁸ In Mexico, in the realm of public administration, political participation exhibits a preference for individuals from the gay community. Selection processes tend to favour handpicked candidates, perpetuating a patriarchal arrangement. Notably, there appears to be a lack of coexistence between the BTI community and the gay community within this framework.

⁹ **Heteronormativity** is understood as "the privileging of heterosexuality and the rigid definition of gender identities, sexualities, and gender relations – reinforces clear distinctions between men and women." See: Human Rights Council, "Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human

To address these systemic barriers, **transformative approaches to governance structures and programming are essential**. LGBTI representation must be integrated at all levels, ensuring diverse perspectives inform decision-making processes. Promoting meaningful participation requires the dismantling of tokenistic practices that perpetuate exclusion and marginalisation of LGBTI identities.

D. Section IV. E. of the draft: Civil society participation in decision-making systems

Civil society organising for LGBTI women is often a matter of survival; access to public services and political participation for these communities and can be highly limited, making organising necessary for survival. The survival-based organising efforts of LGBTI communities and sex workers, particularly around health and housing rights, underscore the urgent need for comprehensive support mechanisms. Moreover, barriers to organising, such as the **criminalisation of freedom of speech and association**, as well as the **criminalisation of sex work**, lead to stigmatisation and discrimination. This creates a cycle of normalised and often incentivised violence that ultimately inhibits LGBTI women from participating in decision-making processes.

In addition, in Latin America and other regions, there has been a **crisis since the COVID-19 pandemic, weakening LGBTI activism and participation** in multi-level decision-making processes. Many individuals ceased activism due to the lack of socioeconomic conditions and increased precariousness. Threats and paranoia induced by anti-gender and anti-rights movements have, at times, compelled civil society organisations to relocate their offices or operate exclusively online, implementing security protocols such as the necessity for accompaniment when crossing international borders, especially for trans women. Civil society organisations with a long history in certain countries, instrumental for placing LGBTI issues on the international agenda, have disappeared.

Anti-gender and anti-rights movements and their negative impact on LGBTI civil society organisations

A significant challenge to the advancement of LGBTI participation in decision-making systems is **the rise of anti-rights and anti-gender narrative**. Across the globe, **feminist and LGBTI groups confront escalating challenges posed by coordinated and well-funded anti-rights and anti-gender movements**, promoted by conservative and religious groups and lobbies, as well as by 'TERFs' (Trans-Exclusionary Radical Feminists) and 'SWERFs' (Sex Work(er) Exclusive Radical Feminists). These narratives attempt to undermine the recognition of human rights

rights defenders" (2019), UN Doc No. A/HRC/40/60, <<https://www.undocs.org/Home/Mobile?FinalSymbol=A%2FHRC%2F40%2F60&Language=E&DeviceType=Mobile&LangRequested=False>>.

for LGBTI individuals by framing their existence and demands as threats to ‘traditional values’ and ‘societal norms,’ seeking to discredit the legitimacy of non-binary, trans, and gender-diverse identities. This manifests in various forms, including legal and social challenges to anti-discrimination bills and legislations, and the vilification of LGBTI people within public discourse.

For instance, in the United States, the Human Rights Campaign declared a ‘state of emergency’ for LGBTI persons. As of 31 May 2023, the organisation reported its involvement in addressing over 500 anti-LGBTI bills across more than 40 states,¹⁰ with over 220 bills targeting trans and non-binary people.¹¹ In 2023, a total of 45 anti-LGBTI laws, particularly anti-trans laws, were enacted. These laws included prohibitions on gender-affirming care for trans youth, laws permitting the misgendering of trans students, laws targeting drag performances, laws establishing a legal basis for discrimination, and restrictions on school curriculum, including books.¹²

These narratives not only **hinder the advancement of LGBTI rights but also contribute to an environment where discrimination, harassment, and violence against LGBTI individuals persist and become reinforced.** These movements perpetuate hate narratives rooted in negative stereotypes, exacerbating discrimination against LGBTI individuals and impeding their participation in decision-making processes. Moreover, these movements often receive better funding opportunities compared to women’s and LGBTI organisations, as high-level political figures and individuals in positions of power tend to support them economically and socially. **The disproportionate competition for funding further sidelines LGBTI and women’s organisations,** limiting their capacity to effectively counteract these harmful narratives effectively, and advocate for human rights in general.

Additionally, **anti-gender and anti-rights movements use ‘buzzwords’ or ‘hot-button’ words, narratives, and euphemisms appealing to moral-emotional language to manipulate, such as: ‘integrity,’ ‘traditional family,’ ‘gender ideology,’ ‘values,’ ‘morality,’ ‘deviance,’ and ‘integrity of life.’** Movements such as ‘Con Mis Hijos No Te Metas’ have a wide influence in societies, and the use and promotion of **this language allow hate speech to expand, leading public institutions and authorities to exacerbate cycles of violence.** Negative stereotypes of LGBTI women are therefore institutionalized and become part of social structures by public actors, which leads to a scenario of further discrimination and violence against LGBTI women.

¹⁰ Gay Times, “Human Rights Campaign declares “state of emergency” for LGBTQ+ Americans” (2023) <<https://www.gaytimes.co.uk/life/human-rights-campaign-declares-state-of-emergency-for-lgbtq-americans/>>.

¹¹ Human Rights Campaign, “Weekly Roundup of Anti-LGBTQ+ Legislation Advancing in States Across the Country” (2023) <<https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/weekly-roundup-of-anti-lgbtq-legislation-advancing-in-states-across-the-country-3>>.

¹² *ibid.*

Financial constraints, exacerbated by exclusionary funding practices and limited coverage for international travel for conferences, panels, and consultations, further restrict the access of smaller feminist and LGBTI groups to critical spaces and resources. Meanwhile, anti-gender movements capitalise on global trends, weaponizing LGBTI topics to fuel societal divisions and foster antagonism towards marginalised communities. The resulting **erosion of rights and democratic processes caused by anti-rights and anti-gender movements poses long-term challenges to the advancement of LGBTI rights**.

Furthermore, **anti-rights and anti-gender groups employ disinformation campaigns and scapegoating tactics, specifically targeting LGBTI women** and constructing false narratives to undermine their rights and safety. These movements utilise scapegoating tactics, particularly directed at trans women, by constructing false narratives portraying LGBTI spaces as a perceived threat to 'biological females.' The use of disinformation and proselytism by these groups is also prevalent in public discussions about policies by public authorities and private actors. For instance, in Guatemala, there is a business model that operates similarly to call centres, known as 'NetCenters,' that disseminate fake news through bots and fake accounts.¹³ Political parties and high-level political figures hire these systems, especially during elections and political debates, to manipulate public opinion and votes.

Within civil society organisations, volunteer-based work predominates, leaving LGBTI women either unpaid or subject to unequal pay and working conditions compared to their male counterparts. **Despite their lived experiences, LGBTI women are often not considered as 'experts,'** further exacerbating disparities. This disparity in treatment normalises burnout and a disregard for their mental health and safety, often compensated with 'stipends' instead of salaries and decent working conditions. Moreover, **funding disparities between organisations in the Global South and those in the Global North**, and organisations that work for the government as opposed to independently, worsen existing inequalities, perpetuating power imbalances within the advocacy landscape.

The **normalisation and substantial rise of hate speech**, both from political figures and leaders, in the media, in person, and online, compounds the challenges faced by LGBTI communities, perpetuating discriminatory attitudes and behaviours. **Legislative tools such as General Recommendation No. 40 must explicitly address the threat posed by anti-rights and anti-gender movements to democratic processes and marginalised groups' ability to organise and participate in decision-making processes.**

Moreover, fundamentalist groups wield significant political influence at all levels of decision-making systems, aligning with white supremacist ideologies to further marginalise LGBTI

¹³ Universidad del Valle Guatemala, "Detrás de los Netcenters: ¿Los malos o los buenos de las redes sociales?" (2019) <<https://noticias.uvg.edu.gt/detras-de-los-netcenters-los-malos-o-los-buenos-de-las-redes-sociales/>>.

individuals and erode hard-won rights. These groups also 'fixate' on certain LGBTI candidates and authorities, openly discriminating them through diverse media channels. **Anti-gender and anti-right movements also have a societal impact regarding the social support of LGBTI groups** through social media, conventional activism (such as parades and protests), funding, and donations. **Safety protocols** are imperative for LGBTI organisations participating in decision-making processes, given the pervasive direct attacks, threats of violence, and discrimination perpetuated by anti-rights and anti-gender movements. These result in the narrowing of avenues for political participation of LGBTI women. There is a need to apply for safety visas, plan the protection of their families, and implement general safety measures to protect one's integrity, especially as it is a risk to be in a clear public position or stance as an LGBTI woman.

The damage inflicted by these groups will require years to rectify, as it entails the erasure of rights that have been historically fought for and a process of democratic and human rights backsliding. **Legislative measures targeting 'gender ideology' and inclusive language, especially within educational settings**, alongside moralistic narratives, deepen discrimination. This necessitates a robust response from treaty bodies to safeguard LGBTI rights amidst pervasive regressive political agendas that permeate all public institutions and private entities, creating a cascade situation of discrimination and the spread of hate speech.

This also occurs at regional and international fora, impacting local processes. Civil society organisations strive to secure a seat at the table in the international arena, yet the recommendations from treaty bodies are not necessarily implemented at the local level due to the expansion of anti-rights and anti-gender movements within local governments. Even if implemented, it may be merely a facade, serving to fulfil a certain mandate, or exist only on paper without actual effect. Efforts to combat these challenges require **concerted action, both within feminist movements and through alliances with other advocacy groups**, such as those focused on climate change and health. Countering anti-rights and anti-gender narratives requires a comprehensive approach, which should involve extensive education and awareness campaigns aimed at challenging discriminatory stereotypes.

E. In relation to section V. B. of the draft: Intersectionality and diversity among LGBTI women

The multifaceted nature of identity intersects with various factors such as age, class, caste, race, religion, disability, body shape, migrant or refugee status, indigenous identity, sex work, SOGIESC, and other intersections, **shaping the experiences of LGBTI women in political participation and decision-making systems**. The **absence of statistical data disaggregated by these identities, including SOGIESC**, hampers the understanding of their specific challenges and needs. Limited information is available to evaluate and design policies and legislation

based on empirical data that promote inclusivity and diversity in decision-making systems at different levels. In addition, **population censuses often overlook questions related to SOGIESC**, further exacerbating this lack of crucial data for policy formulation and implementation.

The lack of legal gender recognition as a barrier to inclusivity in decision-making systems

Legal barriers, such as **the absence of legal gender recognition** in many states, pose significant obstacles for gender-diverse, non-binary persons, and trans women to exercise public functions under their authentic identities. The absence of legal gender recognition leads to the misidentification of political figures, using their dead name and legal gender instead of their chosen name and affirmed gender, despite public disclosures of their identity.

The lack of gender recognition not only undermines their right to self-determination and bodily autonomy but also exposes them to heightened risks of violence and discrimination in decision-making systems. Moreover, the exclusion of trans women due to the lack of legal gender recognition extends beyond political realms, impacting their access to human rights such as education, healthcare, and housing, further impeding their ability to engage in political processes. Therefore, **CEDAW should recognise in General Recommendation No. 40 that the lack of legal gender recognition in some states is an issue that limits political participation and can expose trans women to discrimination and violence.**

In some countries, although systems of public consultation have been established, there is limited transparency, monitoring, and accountability for the public. Thus, these consultations tend to lack substantive and transformative impact. It is common for **public consultation tools to be used as a facade, merely to 'tick a box' and create the appearance of public participation**, when in reality, this participation is superficial. Even when these tools are technically 'available,' they might not be accessible to the general public but rather to a select few civil society organisations closely aligned with the state or elite groups.¹⁴ There is a crucial need for **intentional involvement of LGBTI civil society organisation in every stage of policymaking**. Community-led monitoring systems that are independent and grant autonomy to communities are essential for providing feedback about policy creation and implementation and to ensuring inclusive participation in decision-making systems.

¹⁴ In Chile, the government is working on a trans healthcare policy; however, there are limited opportunities to participate in open consultations, and these are often closed to certain individuals and/or groups, typically from elite backgrounds and circles.