

# **Inter-Agency Standing Committee and United Nations Chief Executives Board Task Force on Addressing Sexual Harassment in the Organizations of the UN System**

## **Second Meeting of Investigatory Bodies on Protection from Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Sexual Harassment**

**4 November 2019**  
**Palais des Nations, Geneva**  
**Summary Report**

### **Background**

To review progress against recommendations from the 2018 meeting and provide an opportunity to highlight and share good practice across the United Nations entities and partners, the CEB and IASC Secretariats brought together heads and senior staff of investigatory bodies from twenty-six CEB Task Force and IASC members. Fifty-four participants included representatives from twenty UN departments and agencies, the World Bank Group, the Red Cross movement, and twelve NGO/ NGO consortia.

The objectives were to follow-up on the recommendations from the 26 November 2018 Investigators' Meeting, take stock of progress made by the CEB Task Force on Sexual Harassment work on investigations, and review status of common guidance and initiatives for possible adoption by IASC agencies.

Kelly Clements, Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees, Chair of the CEB Task Force on Addressing Sexual Harassment and on behalf of the IASC Champion on PSEA and sexual harassment, opened the meeting. The results of the UN Safe Space Survey on sexual harassment demonstrated the extent of the problem and the need for continued efforts. Over the past year, the IASC has prioritized protection from SEA, this has resulted in higher engagement in 24 humanitarian countries. Enhanced awareness-raising, training on the understanding of principles, strengthening policies and efforts on data collection are among priority actions a global level. The IASC has strengthened the Six Core Principles Relating to SEA and vetting and reference checking are being improved with two initiatives. The Inter-Agency Misconduct Disclosure Scheme facilitates systematic sharing of sexual misconduct data between humanitarian and development agencies. Twenty-five UN entities are now using the Clear Check system. [ndlr. Clear Check is a secure centralized database to share information across the UN system on individuals who have established allegations related to sexual harassment (SH) and sexual exploitation and sexual abuse (SEA) with the aim to prevent re-employing them within the UN system.]

There is still a need to provide immediate support and services before, during and after investigations. Ms. Clements pointed to the recent study by UN Women [*What will it take? Promoting cultural change to end sexual harassment*] that focused on victim-focused work and the need for lasting cultural change.

### **I. Challenges in Investigating Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA)**

The first panel, chaired by Ben Swanson, Director of Investigation Services from the UN Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), presented an update on recent statistics, challenges faced, and lessons learned in investigations in the field.

Investigations into SEA spiked to 26 percent in 2016, largely due to the Central African Republic (CAR) investigation. Of these cases, 9 percent related to sexual violence, 50 percent to exploitation, and 20 percent of victims are minors. OIOS shared reflections on the specific challenges in the CAR. These included: deficient initial reporting, finding the right mix of investigators with a specific skill set, the difficult operating environment, quality of in-country partners, and proper case management.

Insufficient information collection at the initial reporting and lack of cooperation by the entity collecting such information led to the development of the UN system-wide Incident Reporting Form (IRF). The form is comprehensive and has many fields to complete; which has led to challenges in using the IRF, as it is claimed that the person filling in the form need to understand the purpose of the various fields, to avoid false reporting or failed allegations. During the initial stages, OIOS confirmed that a victim is entitled to support services even if the allegation is unsubstantiated. The CAR investigation also faced many logistical challenges during the 140-day large-scale deployment, including security of the investigators, budgetary constraints, and poor living environment and exposure to Malaria and other diseases. Investigators had to organize the periodic deployment of food supplies from Bangui as the availability locally was scarce and of dubious sanitary conditions. However, this in itself was a challenge; more than once food supplies purchased by investigators in Bangui and sent to their colleagues in the field had sat at the airport in inadequate storing conditions – perishing.

Finding investigators who were able to function in this environment and had skills in interviewing children was also a human resource challenge. OIOS has subsequently partnered with the National Children's Advocacy Center in developing and rolling out a training programme to improve interviewing techniques when the victim is a child.

The operational environment demonstrated the importance of having a case manager on the ground to oversee the investigation from start to finish. Investigators were not always uploading interview records and other documents in a consistent or timely manner. This was also linked to staff turnover on the ground. The quality of DNA collection was not always consistent, which resulted in two sets of samples becoming non-viable for testing following prolonged storage. DNA samples are now sent as soon as possible to reliable laboratories to avoid the risk of them becoming unusable.

The entire operation had to also deal with the ground reality of corruption manifesting among some stakeholders. Entities and/or persons responsible for ensuring OIOS had access to victims were found to be presenting persons multiple times, under different identities as well as coaching witnesses and victims on testimonies to be rendered at interview.

Lessons learned are now being systematically implemented. This includes more and better training, in particular specific training to interview children, and training national investigation officers. Other lessons include vetting investigators who have the right skillset to operate in challenging environments, and better interaction with UN partners on the ground.

The UN Victim's Rights Advocate, Jane Connors, reported on field challenges and addressing victims' access to justice, protection, and assistance. Victims expressed concern about complicated complaint pathways and distressing investigative processes including repeated interviews by various actors. Many

victims were concerned about paternity identification and support for their children. Victims lacked access to documents, laboratory tests, and other information necessary to pursue their children's claims. UN Field Victims' Rights Advocates (FVRA) have been helpful in addressing challenges and providing information to those working directly with victims in the four countries they are deployed (Central African Republic, DR Congo, Haiti, and South Sudan) but more FVRA are needed where the UN has a large footprint (i.e. Colombia, Bangladesh, Lebanon, and Mali). A uniform system-wide tracking system (case-management tool) which monitors support in a systematic manner and ensures there are comprehensive and accurate data would be useful. OIOS emphasized that a victim-centered approach is about bringing to bear the same standard you would expect for yourself, i.e. "how you would expect to be treated if put in this situation".

Remarks from participants converged around the need for a dedicated discussion on whether investigative bodies should proceed without the consent and cooperation of victims. One agency found that a third of sexual harassment victims decided not to pursue a formal process, which could be due to threats from the perpetrator or offers of money.

Henrik Malmquist, Head of Investigation Service from UNHCR, updated on the increase in SEA complaints, mostly attributable to the increase in allegations implicating implementing partner personnel. The number of complaints implicating UNHCR personnel is expected to decrease by 30% in 2019 (extrapolated figures) versus 2018. UNHCR is finalizing Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) on how to implement a victim-centered approach which will complement their own investigation guidelines. These SOPs will take into account the Victims' Rights statement, and incorporate the nine rights of victims, including to: be treated with respect to dignity, safety and well-being; receive assistance and support; receive information; be heard and to participate; privacy and confidentiality; informed consent; protection; report possible misconduct and to access accountability; and remedy. The SOPs will not override other documents on the investigation procedures (i.e. relating to due process rights). UNHCR intends to make the SOPs not only be applicable to victims of SEA, but to victims of other types of misconduct.

Jason Uliana, Head of Investigations from UNICEF, spoke about the OIOS protocol on interviewing victims and sharing of information, which has since been adopted by UNICEF. A large part of OIOS' work is investigating into troops from contributing countries, governed by MoUs. Under this MoU, the Member State should decide who and how to do the investigation within 10 days. As soon as OIOS receives complaints, they deploy investigators to preserve evidence and to ensure that any subsequent NIO investigation is not jeopardized by protracted time for deployment and that victims are interviewed and handled in accordance with a victim-centered approach. OIOS has developed a consistent practice of preserving evidence in TCC cases to ensure that the victims' and the UN's interest are appropriately handled and safeguarded. How the investigation is conducted also depends on who is the target of the investigation, whether staff, troops or vendors. Institutional vendors have the prime responsibility to investigate matters of SEA implicating their employees. Oversight bodies can provide assistance, especially in monitoring the activities of those institutional vendors. The responsible UN entities shall ensure victim assistance.

A further discussion on a victim-centered approach to investigations raised the issue of the pressure to report all allegations to donors. For transparency, the UN publishes real-time data on allegations on the

internet<sup>1</sup>. Reporting should protect confidentiality and be motivated by a ‘need-to-know’ basis. There was consensus that there is a need to fundamentally and jointly address how we report to donors.

#### *Proposed actions*

- Improve initial reports and response time to establish the investigation from the outset. The Incident Reporting Format is a step to address this, to be improved and applied to more contexts.
- Improve communication to victims to provide more information at each of the investigation process.
- Draft SOPS on implementing a victim centered approach in investigations which incorporate the forthcoming Victims’ rights statement.
- Jointly address donor requests for reporting (nb. See UN SEA WG on harmonized partner agreement)

## **II. Innovations and Solutions to Improve Investigations into Sexual Misconduct**

Gareth Price-Jones, Executive Secretary from the Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR) presented the latest developments of the Inter-Agency Misconduct Disclosure Scheme, which is designed to systematically address the problem of abusers from moving countries or organizations. The scheme links to other specific efforts to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse through the employment cycle, which includes the Interpol pilot of an international criminal vetting system for the Aid Sector, the DFID-led Humanitarian Passport Scheme and the UN Clear Check database. The 15 Signatories that have endorsed it abide to two main commitments: one is to systematically check with previous employers about any SEA issues relating to potential new hires, the other is to respond systematically to such checks from others. As of end October 2019, the scheme was used for more than 1850 recruitments, resulting in at least 10 applicants being rejected at the final stage of recruitment based upon negative or absent misconduct data. This demonstrates that even in the current environment, abusers are still applying for jobs with large, high profile humanitarian organizations. Without systematic checks on all hires, the risk of abusers moving between agencies will remain a significant for all humanitarian agencies, and impact their beneficiaries, staff, reputation and funding. SCHR is also compiling a database of legal frameworks applicable to sexual misconduct cases which will be available to the public on the SCHR website<sup>2</sup>. While there may still be a need for individual case-specific advice, the legal database will provide a supportive indicative framework.

To be effective, more agencies will need to subscribe, and SCHR will need to allay concerns about data protection. The Misconduct Disclosure Scheme does not comprise a centralised database, the main purpose is to facilitate information transfer between past employers and potential future employers.

Miranda Brown, PSEAH manager from the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) Alliance, briefed on their certification scheme for investigators on sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment. The purpose is to improve the quality of investigations through harmonized training leading to certification of investigators. CHS Alliance is developing on-line testing, with adequate donor support, it should be launched by end

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.un.org/preventing-sexual-exploitation-and-abuse/content/data-allegations-un-system-wide](http://www.un.org/preventing-sexual-exploitation-and-abuse/content/data-allegations-un-system-wide)

<sup>2</sup> [www.schr.info/the-misconduct-disclosure-scheme](http://www.schr.info/the-misconduct-disclosure-scheme)

2020. The components of the certification scheme include candidate selection, comprehensive online training and study materials, computer-based testing in an accredited center, residential training for candidates with simulation exercises and a final exam. In addition, the certification would offer validation of experience and ongoing training to maintain the certification.

As a result of efforts to strengthen the from International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC) central compliance function, Maria Thestrup, Head of Global Compliance informed there has been a 174% increase in SEA reporting. By growing the compliance team from two to 22 staff, the ICRC was able to improve their response and policy commitments. ICRC improvements focused on coordination, trust and coherence across the organization, ensuring both legal and cultural approaches to prevent bias. ICRC also worked on defining the attitudes of a good SEA investigator, including individual quality and performance indicators against which each member of the team as well as the team as a whole could be held accountable. As success factors, the investigator must communicate with the victim and built trust, and the competing interests of the organisation versus those of victims' rights must be managed. Good investigations also include better focus on relevant evidence, effective analysis, and being aware of trauma and the need for empathy. A good investigator should demonstrate effective application of the policy and accept that the investigation might fail.

Despite cultural issues and a staff union challenging both prevention and management of SEA cases, UNRWA has a more than 100 percent increase in reported cases. Vincent Pritt, Head of Investigations for the UN Refugee Works Agency (UNRWA) provided an insight into the specific challenges and risks in Jordan, where UNRWA serves the education and health needs of 500,000 students. He mentioned that, in their organization, the situation is further complicated by the fact that staff and beneficiaries often live with each other, that staff can be beneficiaries at the same time, and that some beneficiaries can be abusers. Several initiatives were launched, including in the area of education (e.g. role playing in schools, training on how to report, Ending Violence Against Children (EVAC) programme); establishment of training programme for part-time local staff and the approval of policies where a chaperone is present for all medical patients.

Francesca Marotta, Chief of Methodology Education and Training Section from the UN Office for the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) highlighted the need for proactive engagement with state investigatory bodies. OHCHR has supported survivors to seek justice in the national jurisdiction of the perpetrators. Operationalising protection is a key challenge for OHCHR at the nexus between UN/international and local investigators. OHCHR ensures that that national investigations respect the rights of the victims (such as informed consent, protection from stigmatisation, confidentiality. Protocols on disclosure may protect some victims, as well as better understanding as to where the UN can engage. An example of a protective measure would be to allow victims to testify in a different location, rather than in their community of origin.

### **III. United Nations Secretariat Responses to Sexual Harassment in the wake of #metoo and #aidtoo Movements**

The panel discussed various initiatives led by the Secretary General in wake of the #metoo and #aidtoo movements that have led to initiatives to improve investigations and organizational culture, reshaping the way OIOS and the UN Ombudsman and Mediation Services provide assistance.

As a result of the #metoo movement, reports of sexual harassment increased from 21 in 2017 to 86 in 2018, and a projected 97 in 2019, resulting in 8 investigations in 2017 and 42 investigations in 2018. For potential sexual harassment cases, there is an expedited intake process, swift assessment and a lower bar for opening the investigation.

OIOS presented challenges and lessons from investigations of sexual harassment cases. Understanding what constitutes sexual harassment and addressing misconceptions is critical. Sometimes victims may not immediately understand that they are being sexually harassed. Subjects of investigations have asserted their behavior was within their cultural norm, such as “it is in my culture to compliment women on their hair and dress” (97.5 percent of victims are women). Leadership should also clearly communicate boundaries. Senior UN officials may be dismissive of complaints where they may have experienced similar misconduct.

Digital forensic data has gained importance. The credibility of the complaint can be established by examining telephone, email, and other messaging traffic. Immediate recording of the initial complaint through the appropriate channels also helps establish credibility of the case. Anonymous complaints are more difficult, as they could represent malicious cases. Where the case is not substantiated, both the subject and complainant may suffer reputational damage.

Increased awareness and investigations of sexual harassment cases has led to a change of workplace behavior.

The UN Ombudsman has an important role in problem-solving. UN Ombudsman Shireen L. Dodson explained their services include mediation, informal resolution, conflict coaching and workplace restoration. The Ombuds office welcome people who seek resolution without an investigation. Their office offers structured mediation which is informal, safe and confidential. There are 8 Ombuds offices, in regional locations in addition to New York and Geneva, that can receive cases.

The advantages of Ombudsmen are many-fold. They assist and facilitate mediation for inconclusive cases following an investigation, which helps colleagues to go back to work in the same environment. Actions or consequences are not imposed by any formal authority. Ombudsmen help victims identify and define sexual harassment, consulting with a victim-centered approach in mind. They offer support to anyone including the victim, bystander or perpetrator. Conflict coaching can be done for the perpetrator, for example if a result of cultural miscommunication. Parties must agree before any action is undertaken which provides interaction and initiative. The Ombudsman Office can help change workplace culture and achieve dignity through civility, lessening the need for investigative services.

#### **IV. Jurisprudence of International Administrative Tribunals: Implications for Investigations of Sexual Harassment**

The Panel presented an update on the work of the Sub-Group on Strengthening Investigatory Capacity and Improving Investigations of Sexual Harassment within the Organizations of the UN System. The Panel explained that the work of the Sub-group was divided into three main workstreams: i) develop a model for investigations of sexual harassment; ii) improve the resourcing of sexual harassment investigations; and iii) to improve accountability.

As part of the workstream to improve accountability, guidance was developed regarding analyzing the jurisprudence of administrative tribunals on evidentiary standards, assessment of evidence and credibility, and disclosure of investigation reports. The Panel presented the findings of the CEB Task Force Sub-Group on this workstream.

##### *Evidentiary Standards*

Peri Lynne Johnson, Legal Advisor and Director in Office of Legal Affairs in IAEA and Phyllis Hwang, Senior Legal Officer in UN Office of Legal Affairs presented the Sub-Group's work on evidentiary standards. Ms. Johnson noted that international organizations continue to have different evidentiary standards for finding misconduct: the UN Appeals Tribunal (UNAT) requires misconduct to be established based on "clear and convincing evidence" when the staff member's employment relationship is terminated; the World Bank Administrative Tribunal (WBAT) applies a "clear and convincing" standard; and the ILO Administrative Tribunal (ILOAT) follows a "beyond a reasonable doubt" standard.

The different wording of these standards raised concerns among the investigation community that it would be difficult to establish the facts to meet the standards. To assist in addressing these concerns, the Sub-group conducted a review of 159 judgments rendered during the period 2010 to March 2019 by the UNAT, ILOAT, and the WBAT. From a review of these judgments, the panelists noted that the justification behind most of the tribunals' decisions to rescind the disciplinary sanctions is not because the evidentiary threshold is too difficult to establish a finding of misconduct. Rather, Tribunals are primarily rescinding decisions because of procedural irregularities during the investigation, the failure of the Executive Head to justify departures from the recommendations of the joint review bodies, or the proportionality of the sanction imposed.

During the Panel's discussions, participants discussed and clarified that at the investigation stage, a very low evidentiary threshold is applied by the investigators in establishing the factual record. The panelists emphasized that the role of investigators are independent and neutral fact finders. They are tasked with creating an evidentiary record, and to present the facts in a clear and objective manner. The standards applied by the different administrative tribunals for making a finding of misconduct are to be applied at the end of the process; that is, at the disciplinary decision-making stage and not at the investigation stage.

The panelists emphasized that an important take away from the work of the UN Sub-Group is that decision-makers should not pre-emptively refrain from imposing disciplinary measures based on a fear that the evidentiary standards are too difficult to meet, and investigators should not close cases out of concern that the "beyond reasonable doubt" or "clear and convincing" standard has not been met.

### *Types of Evidence and Credibility Determinations*

Jodi Glasow, Chief Counsel of Investigations in the World Bank Group and Phyllis Hwang, Senior Legal Officer in UN Office of Legal Affairs presented the Sub-Group's work on types of evidence and credibility determinations. The Sub-Group reviewed 107 judgments during the period 2010-2019 to identify the types of evidence administrative tribunals have accepted to support a finding of misconduct. These include statements of victims, witnesses present at the incident and who saw/spoke to the victim following the incident; concessions or admissions by the subject; electronic communications; medical reports; identification in a photographic array; and findings and opinions of experts.

In assessing the credibility of statements of victims and witnesses, the Sub-Group noted that the Tribunals adopted two approaches: (i) the presumption against false testimony (*e.g.* Tribunals have declined to presume that a victim or a witness will give false testimony); and (ii) statements cannot be discounted based on relationship or speculative motive (*e.g.* a relationship between a victim and a corroborating witness, including a familial relationship, does not provide a basis to disregard automatically the witness testimony of a family member, a friend or coworker).

The types of elements Tribunals have considered when assessing the credibility of a complainant, witness or alleged perpetrator include the timing of reporting, inconsistent, vague or inaccurate statements, implausible explanation, fabrication of evidence, and the demeanor of the parties. In a judgment issued by the UNDT, the Tribunal noted that the absence of corroborating evidence should not, in and of itself, defeat an allegation of sexual harassment where conclusions can be drawn about the respective credibility of the parties – credible oral victim testimony alone may be fully enough. The panelists underscored the deference the Tribunals give to investigators in making credibility determinations of the witnesses' statements and explanations provided, and the important role such determinations play in establishing a finding of misconduct.

In addition to the many factors Tribunals consider in assessing the credibility of victim's statements is the proximity of the report to the incident in question. Although much is given to those victims' credibility who promptly report an incident, a judgment rendered by the WBAT found that delay in reporting instances of harassment should not be used to undermine the credibility of an allegation.

### *Sharing the Investigation Report*

Susan Maddox, Chief, Appeals and Accountability Section, Administrative Law Division, UN Office of Human Resources presented the Sub-Group's work relating to the UN and the WB on the sharing the investigation report with the complainant and/or victim. Under the new instructional guidance of the UN, the UN is not required to provide a full disclosure of the investigation report to the complainants. The alleged offender and affected individual have the right to know the outcome of the matter following each stage of the process for handling a formal complaint. The practice is to provide the complainant with a detailed summary of the investigation and subsequent administrative action, if any. Only pursuant to an order from the UNDT after an official administrative action is taken against the alleged offender will a complainant be provided with a copy of the investigation report. This is determined on a case-by-case basis



and “extraordinary circumstances” must be shown. Moreover, the “requirements of good faith and fair dealing” are considered.

The WBAT only mandates the disclosure of the draft and final investigation reports with the subjects of the investigations. In some cases, the WBAT has ordered the sharing of the investigation report with the complainant upon appeal of the investigation process and disciplinary outcome. Complainants should know whether the decision maker found misconduct, and what disciplinary decision is imposed on the subject. The WBG is considering sharing investigation reports with the complainants, or in the alternative, providing a detailed summary of the outcome of the investigation.

Ms. Johnson explained that the ILOAT has held that, in the spirit of due process, the right to have access to the investigation report applies equally to the accused and to the reporter of misconduct. Great importance is placed on communicating with victims throughout the process and at its conclusion. A number of factors are considered by the ILOAT in whether to share the investigation report with the complainant, including whether the report was the basis of a final administrative decision adversely affecting the complainant; whether there is a need to protect any information in the report; and whether the complainant has been provided a sufficiently detailed summary of the report to allow a proper defense or establish a case.

### *Conclusions*

- Decision makers should not pre-emptively refrain from making findings of sexual harassment based on a fear that the evidentiary standards are too difficult to meet.
- Investigators should focus on presenting the facts in an objective, neutral and meticulous manner, weighing the credibility of the witnesses’ testimonies. Moreover, investigators should refrain from reaching conclusions about whether evidentiary standards have been met at the fact-finding stage.
- Allegations of sexual harassment can be sustained even in the instances where there is limited, if any, corroborating evidence. The direct evidence of eyewitnesses who personally witnessed the incident should not be treated as the only type of acceptable corroborating evidence. Circumstantial evidence and evidence from witnesses who encountered the victim shortly after an incident can also constitute corroborating evidence.
- Complainants have the need and the right to know about the outcome of an investigation and any resulting disciplinary sanctions. Organizations should strive to have in place a clear policy regarding the disclosure of the report and/or summary of the investigation and findings to complainants, or at least ensure a consistent practice in line with the applicable jurisprudence.

## **V. Forward-Looking Agenda**

As a result of this meeting, the exchange of perspectives has generated content which will benefit the UN system at large. OIOS is designing an investigation manual and training specifically for sexual harassment cases. An ongoing project funded by DFID involves an academic researcher reviewing 15 years

of SEA data in granular detail to better understand trends, challenges, and to lessons from previous investigations. Participating agencies are welcome to share SEA data from their individual organizations, to add to the collective learning.

IASC partners underscored the need for more dedicated resources and a harmonized and coordinated approach to investigations. In her closing remarks, the Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator (DERC), Ms. Ursula Mueller, urged participants to go beyond planning documents and to focus on operations and implementation. The IASC should endeavor to protect the independence of investigation services and leverage different strengths of the partners. Ms. Mueller also highlighted the OCHA Fund for Investigations as a means to support partners in sourcing investigation capacity and underlined this meeting as an important forum to promote a coordinated approach. She also noted that the IASC will continue to promote initiatives such as the Inter-Agency Misconduct Disclosure Scheme across the humanitarian system, as well as victim-centered approaches in line with the IASC Strategy on PSEA. Coordination requires dedicated resources and cannot be solved by one agency alone.

Kelly Clements, Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees, Chair of the CEB Task Force on Addressing Sexual Harassment recognized the challenges of bringing different entities and agencies together and encouraged more interaction, building upon the meetings to date. She took note on progress in several areas, and the importance of a gathering of investigators to bring justice to misconduct in the workplace and for those who receive humanitarian assistance.

The DERC and DHC urged participants to identify issues that could be brought forward under the auspices of the IASC as a forum to invest collective efforts in protection from sexual exploitation and abuse. Initiatives such as the CHS Alliance to certify the skill and theoretical knowledge of investigators in sexual misconduct cases similar to an ISO certification, the OCHA Fund for Investigations, and building on agency experience on communicating with victims and survivors were cited as efforts to be leveraged for wider impact.

Among the proposed actions for future work which emanated from the day's discussion, it was agreed to maintain a joint forum between IASC and CEB Task Force members. The forum provides an opportunity to reflect on positive new initiatives and what needs to improve. The work of the CEB Task Force on Sexual Harassment can also provide insight and learning on managing SEA cases. Several IASC members have brought the two areas together under a unified sexual misconduct policy. It would be useful in the future to reflect on how current tools are strengthening accountability throughout the system.

As a next step, OCHA will assess interest in pursuing discussions at a technical level, in particular to advance the work on evidentiary standards and jurisprudence, as well as examining the issues of witness protection and protection from retaliation. Further meetings may be organized around the finalization of new guidance.