Naveen Shodh Sansar (An International Refereed / Peer Review Multidisciplinary Research Journal)
RNI No.- MPHIN/2013/60638, ISSN 2320-8767, E- ISSN 2394-3793, Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF)- 8.054,
April to June 2025, E-Journal, Vol. I, Issue L (50), ISO 9001:2015 - E2024049304 (QMS)

AI and The Women, Peace and Security Agenda in India

Dr. Bhavna Sharma*

***Assistant Professor (Commerce) Wilsonia Degree College, Moradabad (U.P.) INDIA**

Abstract: The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) with the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda offers opportunities to address gender-related challenges in conflict prevention, response, and post-conflict recovery. The WPS agenda, grounded in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000), emphasizes women's participation in peace and security decision-making, protection from conflict-related violence, prevention of violence, and relief and recovery. In India, diverse social, geographic, and security contexts shape both the risks women face and their access to institutions and technology. AI-enabled analytics, early-warning support, digital reporting channels, translation tools, and evidence organization may strengthen gender-responsive policies and women's participation. However, these applications also raise concerns about algorithmic bias, privacy and surveillance, data security, accessibility, language representation, and the digital divide. This paper examines the intersection of AI and the WPS agenda in India through a conceptual and policy-oriented review. It outlines potential applications, ethical and governance requirements, and implementation priorities. It argues that AI should support—not replace—human judgment, survivor-centered services, local knowledge, and women's leadership. Responsible adoption requires meaningful participation, transparent oversight, robust data protection, independent evaluation, and accessible non-digital alternatives. The paper proposes a framework and research agenda for evaluating whether AI-enabled initiatives improve safety, inclusion, accountability, and peacebuilding outcomes. As a conceptual paper, it presents no original fieldwork or causal findings.
Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Women Peace and Security, Gender Equality, Conflict Prevention, India, Digital Inclusion, Ethical AI.

Introduction - Peace and security are not solely matters of military stability or the absence of open conflict. Durable peace also depends on safety, justice, participation, social trust, and access to services. Women may experience insecurity through displacement, gender-based violence, loss of livelihoods, care burdens, and exclusion from decision-making. Women are also peacebuilders, negotiators, community organizers, first responders, and holders of local knowledge.

The Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda recognizes women's agency and the gendered effects of conflict. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325, adopted in 2000, calls for greater participation of women in peace and security processes and attention to gender perspectives in conflict prevention, resolution, peacebuilding, and recovery. Subsequent resolutions developed these commitments.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) may contribute by helping analyze information, detect patterns, support multilingual communication, improve service navigation, and organize reports. Potential uses range from early-warning analysis to more accessible public information. Yet AI can reproduce historical inequities, misclassify risks, expose sensitive information, or encourage intrusive surveillance. Its contribution must be assessed against human rights, gender equality, and community needs.

This paper considers how AI could responsibly support WPS priorities in India. It does not presume that AI is inherently beneficial or that every context involving violence or insecurity should be technologized. It asks what conditions would make carefully governed AI useful, accountable, and inclusive.

Objectives and Research Questions:

1. To explain the relationship between the WPS agenda and emerging AI capabilities.
2. To identify potential AI applications relevant to participation, protection, prevention, and relief and recovery in India.
3. To examine risks involving bias, privacy, security, access, and accountability.
4. To propose a gender-responsive framework and practical recommendations.

Research questions: (1) In what ways might AI support WPS priorities in India? (2) Which risks could undermine safety,

rights, or trust? (3) What governance conditions should guide development, procurement, and deployment?

Research Methodology: This paper adopts a conceptual, narrative policy-review method. It draws on foundational international frameworks and selected institutional guidance on WPS, gender equality, and responsible AI. Themes are organized around participation, protection, prevention, and relief and recovery. This is not a systematic review and does not claim exhaustive database coverage, formal screening, or meta-analysis. No interviews, surveys, or original datasets were collected. The applications discussed are prospective examples, not evidence of established effectiveness in India.

The Women, Peace and Security Agenda

Participation: Participation concerns women's meaningful involvement in negotiations, peace processes, security institutions, governance, and recovery decisions. Representation alone is insufficient if women lack influence over agendas, resources, or outcomes. The WPS approach recognizes women as decision-makers and agents, not merely beneficiaries.

Protection: Protection includes preventing and responding to conflict-related sexual violence and other threats to women's rights and safety. Effective protection requires trusted services, survivor-centered responses, justice pathways, health and psychosocial support, and safeguards against retaliation. Digital tools must not expose survivors or create unsafe records.

Prevention: Prevention involves addressing structural drivers of conflict and gender-based violence, supporting local peace initiatives, and ensuring gender analysis informs policy. Early-warning information can be valuable when credible, contextual, and linked to action. Quantitative signals should complement, not displace, community knowledge.

Relief and recovery: Relief and recovery encompass equitable access to humanitarian assistance, health services, education, livelihoods, documentation, housing, and participation in reconstruction. Women's varied needs—including those of displaced people, persons with disabilities, and marginalized communities—should inform planning and monitoring.

Potential Applications of AI in India

Gender-responsive early warning: With lawful, carefully governed data, analytical tools might help identify changes in service demand, displacement indicators, public incident reports, or other signals relevant to community safety. Systems could help analysts prioritize review, not autonomously label individuals or communities as threats. False alarms, underreporting, manipulation, and uneven data coverage must be anticipated.

Accessible information and service navigation: Conversational interfaces, translation, speech-to-text, and summarization could make information about assistance, legal rights, helplines, shelters, and public programs easier to access across languages and literacy levels. Content must be verified, culturally appropriate, accessible to persons with disabilities, and clear about the limits of automated guidance. High-risk situations should route promptly to trained human responders.

Supporting women's participation: AI-assisted translation, transcription, agenda summarization, and document search may lower barriers to participation in consultations and peacebuilding forums. Tools could help organizers consolidate community submissions and surface overlooked concerns. They should not decide who represents a community, rank contributions by popularity, or replace safe, accessible in-person engagement.

Documentation and institutional learning: Where consent, law, and security permit, tools may assist authorized teams in organizing records, detecting duplicate entries, or finding themes across public policy documents and service feedback. Sensitive testimony requires stringent safeguards. Automated outputs must not be treated as verified evidence without expert review and appropriate evidentiary standards.

Recovery planning and resource allocation: Decision-support models may help planners compare service gaps or forecast needs when reliable, representative data exist. Allocation systems should disclose criteria, allow appeal, and be audited for exclusion. Communities with weak connectivity or limited administrative visibility must not become invisible because their needs are poorly recorded.

Risks and Ethical Challenges

Bias and representational gaps: AI systems learn from data that may underrepresent women in rural, tribal, displaced, minority-language, or otherwise underserved settings. Reported incidents may reflect access to reporting mechanisms rather than actual prevalence. Models can reinforce institutional blind spots. Gender-sensitive evaluation should examine intersectional effects and error patterns.

Privacy, surveillance, and safety: Location traces, identity records, communication logs, and survivor information can cause serious harm if exposed, repurposed, or accessed by abusive actors. Data collection should be minimized and purpose-limited. Access controls, encryption, retention limits, secure deletion, and independent security assessment are essential. In some cases, the safest design is not to collect or centralize data.

Consent and meaningful choice: Consent may be constrained when assistance, safety, or public services depend on participation. People should receive understandable explanations and alternatives where feasible. Survivor-centered practice avoids repeated disclosure, unnecessary data requests, and automated decisions affecting access to support.

Misinformation and deepfakes: Synthetic media and coordinated manipulation may inflame tensions, discredit women leaders, or target peacebuilders. Detection systems

can be imperfect and mistakenly flag authentic material. Responses should combine media literacy, trusted verification, rapid correction, platform accountability, and protection for people at risk.

Digital divide and language inclusion: Connectivity, device affordability, literacy, disability access, and language support differ across communities. Digital-first delivery may widen exclusion. Voice interfaces can help some users but may introduce inaccurate transcription and shared-device privacy risks. Offline, low-bandwidth, and human service channels remain necessary.

Accountability and automation bias: AI recommendations can appear authoritative even when uncertain. Responsibility must remain with identifiable institutions and decision-makers. High-impact systems need documentation, independent evaluation, complaint channels, human review, and clear rules for suspension or withdrawal.

Proposed Gender-Responsive AI Framework:

1. **Purpose and necessity:** define a specific WPS outcome and demonstrate why AI is needed over simpler alternatives.
2. **Co-design and participation:** involve women's groups, local peacebuilders, survivor advocates, disability organizations, language communities, and frontline workers.
3. **Rights and safety assessment:** conduct gender, privacy, human-rights, and threat assessments before deployment and after material changes.
4. **Data stewardship:** minimize collection, define lawful purposes and access, document provenance and limitations, and establish retention and deletion rules.
5. **Human accountability:** assign responsible institutions; preserve human review, appeals, incident reporting, and stop mechanisms.
6. **Monitoring and learning:** evaluate outcomes, harms, distributional effects, community trust, and unintended consequences.

Proposed results chain: responsibly governed AI capability → improved access, analysis, or coordination → better institutional response and participation → potential contribution to WPS outcomes. Each link requires evaluation; improved technical performance alone does not demonstrate improved safety or peace.

Policy and Implementation Recommendations:

1. Develop public guidance for AI in peace, security, gender-based violence response, and humanitarian settings, aligned with applicable law and human-rights obligations.
2. Begin with lower-risk assistive use cases, such as multilingual public information or document accessibility, before considering sensitive predictive applications.
3. Do not delegate high-impact determinations about credibility, eligibility for protection, risk status, or access to assistance to autonomous systems.
4. Create participatory governance with women's organizations and local civil society holding meaningful decision-making roles.
5. Require privacy and security impact assessments, vendor due diligence, model documentation, bias testing, audit access, and incident response.
6. Ensure multilingual, disability-accessible, low-bandwidth, offline, and human-supported channels.
7. Fund digital literacy and technical capacity for women-led organizations, local researchers, and frontline institutions.
8. Publish transparency reports and independent evaluations while protecting confidential information.
9. Establish safe feedback and grievance mechanisms with remedies and protection against retaliation.

Research Propositions and Evaluation Indicators: The following propositions are hypotheses for future empirical testing, not findings:

1. P1: AI-enabled information services are more likely to improve access when they provide accurate local-language content and human referral options.
2. P2: Perceived transparency, privacy protection, and community participation are positively associated with trust in AI-supported services.
3. P3: Unequal connectivity and language coverage moderate the relationship between AI service availability and equitable reach.
4. P4: Human oversight and clear accountability reduce the risk of harmful or exclusionary automated recommendations.

Potential indicators include reach disaggregated by relevant groups where safe and lawful; comprehension and service completion; response time; referral accuracy; user-reported safety and trust; accessibility; complaint resolution; privacy incidents; false-positive and false-negative rates; participation quality; and unintended harm. Metrics should not incentivize surveillance or unnecessary sensitive data collection. Qualitative feedback and independent review are indispensable.

Discussion: AI's potential contributi on to WPS in India lies in supporting institutions and communities to access information, coordinate services, understand patterns, and participate in decisions. Its limitations are equally important. In conflict-affected or high-risk settings, missing or distorted data may make prediction unreliable, while collecting more data may expose vulnerable people. A technically accurate system can still be harmful if its purpose is inappropriate or affected communities cannot challenge decisions.

A WPS perspective changes the question from 'Can AI predict or automate?' to 'Whose priorities shape the system, who benefits, who bears the risks, and who can hold decision-makers accountable?' This places women's agency and institutional responsibility at the center. Trust is earned through service quality, confidentiality,

responsiveness, and justice—not technological sophistication.

India's linguistic and social diversity makes local adaptation essential. A single dataset, language interface, or delivery model cannot be assumed to fit all settings. Partnerships with community organizations can reveal contextual realities, but these organizations should not be burdened with uncompensated data collection or exposed to additional risks.

Conclusion: Artificial Intelligence may offer useful tools for advancing aspects of the WPS agenda in India, including gender-responsive analysis, accessible information, institutional coordination, and women's participation. Its promise is conditional rather than automatic. Bias, privacy threats, digital exclusion, misinformation, and automation bias may undermine the rights and safety that WPS seeks to protect. Responsible implementation should be guided by necessity, inclusion, data minimization, human oversight, transparency, and independent evaluation. AI should complement women's leadership, local knowledge, survivor-centered services, and accountable institutions. Future empirical research should evaluate concrete deployments and measure not only efficiency but safety, equity, trust, participation, and unintended harms.

Limitations and Future Scope: This paper is conceptual and policy-oriented; it has not measured the performance of specific AI systems or assessed program outcomes in India. Examples indicate plausible use cases, not verified deployments or proven impact. Future research could include participatory case studies, interviews with women peacebuilders and service providers, comparative assessments of public-interest AI pilots, and evaluations of language accessibility and safety. Studies should use ethical protocols, avoid unnecessary sensitive data, and include community-defined measures of participation and benefit.

References:-

1. United Nations Security Council. (2000). Resolution 1325 (2000) (S/RES/1325). https://undocs.org/S/RES/1325
2. UN Women. (n.d.). Women, Peace and Security. https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/peace-and-security
3. UN Women. (2024). Women, peace and security: Report of the Secretary-General (S/2024/671). United Nations. https://undocs.org/S/2024/671
4. UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137
5. United Nations. (2024). Governing AI for Humanity: Final Report of the UN Secretary-General's High-level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence. https://www.un.org/ai-advisory-body
6. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2021). The right to privacy in the digital age (A/HRC/48/31). https://undocs.org/A/HRC/48/31

****