

# SEA Risk Assessment Guide



# Table of Contents

<b>SEA Risk Assessment Step by Step Guidance .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>STEP 2 - Scope, Context and Criteria.....</i>	4
<i>STEP 3 – SEA Risk Assessment .....</i>	4
<i>STEP 4 - SEA Risk Response .....</i>	5
<i>STEP 5-Monitoring and Review .....</i>	5
<i>STEP 6-Recording and Reporting.....</i>	5
<b>SEA Risk Assessment - Template .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>Section 1 - External context (country, sub-regional).....</i>	6
<i>Section 2 - Country Office Characteristics.....</i>	7
<b>Country Office commitment to PSEA .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>Guiding Questions to inform situation analysis.....</i>	8
Knowledge and attitudes of staff towards PSEA .....	8
Security situation.....	8
Living and deployment conditions .....	9
Access to and interaction with affected communities.....	9
<b>Tools to aid the report writing.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>SEA Risk Assessment Risk Factor Prioritization Tool.....</i>	11
<i>SEA Risk Factor Matrix For use with Step 4.....</i>	12
<i>Examples of SEA Risk Responses .....</i>	13
<b>What Happens Next? After the SEA Risk Assessment.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>SEA Risk Assessment Monitoring and Review Tool For use with step 6.....</i>	17
<i>SEA Risk Assessment Matrix For use throughout the SEA Risk Assessment Process .....</i>	19

## Contacts

### Ethiopia PSEA Network Co-Chair (UN Women)

Mme. Letty Chiwara

UN Women Ethiopia Country Representative

Point of contact: Lauren McWilliams, [lauren.mcwilliams@unwomen.org](mailto:lauren.mcwilliams@unwomen.org)

### Ethiopia PSEA Network Co-Chair (UNFPA)

Esperance Fundira

UNFPA Ethiopia Country Representative

Point of contact: Dientje van Dongen, [vandongen@unfpa.org](mailto:vandongen@unfpa.org)

### Ethiopia PSEA Network Coordinator

Maria Kjersem

[maria.kjersem@un.org](mailto:maria.kjersem@un.org)

### Communications and Community Engagement Specialist (UN Women)

Alexander Poignant

[alexander.poignant@unwomen.org](mailto:alexander.poignant@unwomen.org)

## Introduction

Assessing and minimizing risks for sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) is key to ensuring programmes are as safe as possible. At the very least, a rapid risk assessment can be conducted at the beginning of an emergency response, but a more thorough risk assessment will be needed once the programme or project is underway. As stated in the Ethiopia PSEA Network's endorsed strategy and workplan for 2021-22 (p.3), all network members and focal points are responsible for organizing risk assessments on a quarterly basis. It is therefore important to keep in mind that the below is not intended as an exhaustive list of potential questions and considerations or a precise instruction as to which approach you are expected to undertake but merely a guide. Please also remember that SEA risks should also be considered at all stages of an intervention or programme cycle.

## SEA Risk Assessment Step by Step Guidance

### STEP 1 - Communication and Consultation

As general principle throughout the SEA risk management process, it is important to include relevant stakeholders, including programmatic and operational staff (both international and national) as well as other relevant stakeholders (e.g., Ethiopia PSEA Network members, other parts of the humanitarian/development response community, national partners, experts, donors, target groups and affected populations). Communication and consultation should take place at regular/planned intervals to inform risk identification, assessment, treatment, monitoring, reporting and review.

The Ethiopia PSEA Network members have committed to doing quarterly SEA risk assessments, so PSEA Focal Points should consider how best to organize these consultations and whether they can be combined with other regular consultations (particularly with the affected communities) in order to make the most efficient use of time and resources. Field program staff should have good experience in organizing consultations with the communities that they serve and will be able to recommend specific strategies.

Staff can be consulted on SEA risk factors during regular staff meetings, workshops, etc, but it would also be useful to hold focus group discussions, ensuring that all levels of staff are included. It is particularly important to make sure that junior level staff (especially women) are included in these consultations, as these are the staff members who may face the greatest challenges in reporting SEA allegations against colleagues.

For more information on how best to organize consultations with staff and affected communities, please refer to the [Good Enough Guide](#).

Guiding questions for these consultations can be found in the **SEA Risk Assessment Template**. There is a set of questions for each of the seven areas listed under Step 2.

## STEP 2 - Scope, Context and Criteria

The purpose of Step 2 is to better understand the external context, Country Office profile, etc. by undertaking a situation analysis. The **SEA Risk Assessment Template** provides a list of key questions to guide the situation analysis and the identification of SEA risks and risk factors and addresses at the following areas:

1. External Context
2. Country Office characteristics
3. Country Office commitment to addressing SEA
4. Knowledge and attitudes of staff
5. Security situation
6. Living and employment conditions
7. Access to and interaction with affected communities

PSEA Focal Points should use these guiding questions to identify SEA risk factors at the various levels of their organization's activities.

## STEP 3 – SEA Risk Assessment

The purpose of Step 3 is to identify, analyze and evaluate risks. Once the PSEA Focal Points have identified key SEA risk factors that need to be addressed by their organization, they can then prioritize these risks for mitigation activities.

A helpful way to prioritize SEA risks is to consider:

1. the **likelihood** that the risk behavior might occur
2. the **impact** that the risk behavior would have (on the survivor, program, organization)

The user can assign a score on a five-point scale (so 1-5) for both the **likelihood** and **impact** (these are subjective scores) and then plot them on a matrix like the one below:

Impact	5					
	4					
	3					
	2					
	1					
		1	2	3	4	5
	Likelihood					

  

High
Substantial
Moderate
Low

This will produce a prioritized list of SEA risk factors that can then be addressed through mitigation activities.

For example:

“*Lack of gender balance in the Country Office*” would probably score a “4” for **likelihood** but “2” for immediate **impact**, so this SEA risk factor would fall in the “moderate” range.

“*Lack of staff training on PSEA*” might score a “4” for **likelihood** but a “5” for immediate **impact**, so this SEA risk factor would fall in the “high” range and would require prioritized attention.

## STEP 4 - SEA Risk Response

Once the SEA risks have been identified and prioritized, the PSEA Focal Points can then work with senior management to development a risk response (management) plan. This would be the basis for the organization’s internal PSEA workplan.

It is important to assign responsibility and accountability for the SEA risk mitigation activities in the risk response (management) plan. For example, a mitigation activity such as “PSEA induction training for all new staff” would be the responsibility of human resources staff in each site office, but the accountability for this activity would rest with the Head of Human Resources in the Country Office. It may also be helpful to assign deadlines for some activities. Please see the **SEA Risk Factor Matrix for Template** for an example of how to format the risk response (management) plan.

## STEP 5-Monitoring and Review

Regular risk monitoring is required to inform management decisions, enabling adaptive management and course corrections. When monitoring the risks, the user may want to ask questions such as:

- Are the risks still relevant? Should any new risks be added?
- Is the list of priority risks still accurate? Have new priority risks emerged? Should any risk be downgraded and no longer be considered a priority?
- Are the scores for the risks still accurate?
- Do any severe/high risks need to be escalated to CO leadership to address?
- What is the trend for each risk? Is the risk remaining constant, or is it increasing or decreasing?
- What is the status of implementation of risk responses? Are they on schedule? Can any risk responses be marked as “completed”?

The Ethiopia PSEA Network members have committed to reviewing their SEA risk assessments on a

## STEP 6-Recording and Reporting

Risk reporting ensures that relevant risk information is available across all levels of the organization in a timely manner to provide the necessary basis for risk-informed decision making. The risks identified

and the actions to be taken to mitigate these risks should be included in the organization's internal PSEA annual workplan and reported on to senior management on a regular basis.

At a minimum, the PSEA Focal Points should report to senior management on the quarterly SEA risk assessment review process.

## SEA Risk Assessment - Template

This is meant to be a template that the PSEA Focal Points can use for their SEA Risk Assessment report. There are guiding questions for each section that can be used during consultations, focus group discussions, etc. referred to under Step 1 of the **SEA Risk Assessment Step by Step Guidance** document. These guiding questions are general in nature and are not necessarily specific to the Ethiopia context. Over time these questions can be refined to more accurately interrogate the situation in Ethiopia as it changes. PSEA Focal Points can use the answers to the guiding questions to inform their situation analysis of each of the seven areas listed under Step 2 of **SEA Risk Assessment Step by Step Guidance** document.

### Section 1 - External context (country, sub-regional)

Analyzing the external context (the landscape in which we work) helps us to understand the circumstances under which we are asking staff to abide by the Code of Conduct, so we can be better prepared to discuss the standards of behavior with our staff. Situational analysis of the external context can be done by the relevant PSEA Network (country or sub-regional). This could be done by a smaller group of Network members, then validated by the wider Network. Each organization in the Network can then use the external context analysis as part of their individual organizational SEA risk assessments. Each context is different, but below are some guiding questions that can help frame the discussion.

#### ***Guiding Questions to inform situation analysis***

1. Does the country/sub-regional context present opportunities for staff to commit SEA, such as:
  - existence of a legal and/or open commercial sex industry
  - high proportion of the population living in poverty or unemployed
  - cultural tolerance of exchange of money or gifts for sex between consenting adults
  - cultural practice of early child marriage
  - weak rule of law system that is unlikely to be able to hold staff to account for criminal acts
2. How do the opportunities for staff to commit SEA differ in the capital compared to field locations? Are there significant sub-regional differences in the context?
3. What risks exist for staff to commit SEA in rest and recuperation (R&R) locations? How easily can acts of SEA be detected in R&R locations?
4. Who in the population is most vulnerable to SEA by staff?
  - domestic workers
  - teenage schoolgirls

- street children
  - migrant workers in bars and restaurants
  - populations fleeing conflict who settle around organizations' bases in search of protection
  - refugees/IDPs who are dependent on UN Agencies and NGOs for humanitarian assistance
5. What does trend analysis of past organization or PSEA Network data on survivors reveal about who is most vulnerable to SEA by staff?
  6. Are staff being approached by the local population and solicited for sex? (e.g., UN or NGO staff being targeted by commercial sex workers in hotel bars or clubs)
  7. How likely are survivors and the general population to report SEA allegations?
    - cultural tolerance of exchange of sex for money or gift between consenting adults may discourage reporting of SEA
    - socially conservative attitudes about extra-marital sex may discourage reporting of SEA

## Section 2 - Country Office Characteristics

We also need to look at the characteristics of the Country Office in order to understand the “corporate” culture in which staff are working.

### *Guiding Questions to inform situation analysis*

1. Does the Country Office (CO) design and implement projects directly (or via partners)? If directly, does the implementation of the projects require extensive contact with populations that are vulnerable to SEA by staff? Which categories of personnel are most in contact with such vulnerable populations?
2. Does project implementation involve deployments to remote locations where there is limited external oversight of staff?
3. Is it a family or non-family duty station? How does this affect the organizational culture of the CO?
4. What is the gender balance among staff? How does this affect the organizational culture of the CO?
5. Do specific categories of personnel have a culture of excessive drinking and/or risk taking (which have been associated factors in some past cases of SEA)?
6. What does trend analysis of past organizational data on SEA allegations and cases reveal about which staff are more likely to commit SEA in the future and under what circumstances? (i.e., data on what has happened in the past can give a good indication of what is likely to happen in the future)

## Country Office commitment to PSEA

We also want to understand how committed the Country Office is to addressing PSEA with its staff and partners.

### *Guiding Questions to inform situation analysis*

1. What is the position of CO leadership about the importance of addressing SEA? Are they sending clear messages to their staff about zero tolerance for SEA?
2. To what extent do CO leadership and managers lead by example and demonstrate through their personal behavior and through their actions in the workplace a commitment to addressing SEA?

## Knowledge and attitudes of staff towards PSEA

It is helpful to have a good understanding of how knowledgeable the organization's staff (from senior management to field staff and support workers) are on PSEA and what their attitude is towards PSEA commitments and activities.

### *Guiding Questions to inform situation analysis*

1. To what extent do staff know what the organization's standards of conduct are on SEA? (e.g., whether personnel undertook the mandatory online training course on SEA)
2. To what extent do staff accept the organization's standards of conduct on SEA? (e.g., are the standards perceived as an unacceptable intrusion into their private lives)
3. To what extent do staff hold attitudes that tolerate or condone certain forms of SEA? (e.g., sex with commercial sex workers or early child marriage)

## Security situation

Working in insecure situations can raise stress levels for our staff, which can lead to risky behavior. We need to review the security situation in areas where we work in order to learn more about how that might impact interaction with vulnerable people.

### *Guiding Questions to inform situation analysis*

1. To what extent does the security situation affect the ability of staff to move around and have contact with the population?
2. Are there lists of out-of-bounds locations? If so, are there adequate resources to patrol these locations? How easily can off-duty staff be distinguished from the population?
3. Do organization-specific or UN policies exist that restrict personnel movements and/or off-duty contact with the population? (e.g., curfews, non-fraternization policies, etc.)



## Living and deployment conditions

Difficult living conditions can also raise stress levels for our staff, which can lead to risky behavior. We need to review the living conditions of our staff (including national staff) in order to learn more about how this might impact interaction with vulnerable people.

### ***Guiding Questions to inform situation analysis***

1. Is welfare provision for staff adequate?
2. Are any international personnel being deployed without leave or breaks for more than twelve months?
3. Is it common practice for specific categories of personnel to avoid taking annual leave due to the high tempo of work/operations?
4. Are the living conditions for staff adequate?

## Access to and interaction with affected communities

It's particularly important that we understand the circumstances under which our staff have access to and engage with vulnerable people in the affected communities that we serve.

### ***Guiding Questions to inform situation analysis***

1. Who will directly or indirectly be benefiting from this program/ intervention (e.g., what is the age, gender, background, status, disabilities, etc.)?
2. What are some of the main characteristics that may render them more susceptible to SEA? Some individuals may have overlapping (inter-sectional) vulnerabilities (e.g., mothers with disabilities, minority women, girls subjected to child marriage, etc.).
3. Which staff/partners/contractors/volunteers are delivering goods and services? Is there an adequate gender balance, particularly for staff directly engaging with affected women and children?
4. Have staff been sufficiently vetted as part of the selection/recruitment process? Have they had PSEA induction training? Has the Network-developed Code of Conduct been explained to them, including volunteers? Have they signed onto the Code of Conduct?
5. What is the size and scale of the program? Will the program or intervention create or exacerbate existing imbalances between program staff and members of the community?
6. Does the program involve direct interaction between staff and children, or other particularly vulnerable groups? (e.g., in-kind distributions).

7. How are staff delivering services (e.g., in private or in public)? Will it involve accessing the homes of vulnerable persons?
8. Would there be witnesses in case of an SEA incident? Are staff working in pairs (ideally gender-mixed)?
9. Does the process for delivering goods and services enable staff and affected people to raise concerns or make complaints in a safe, confidential environment?
10. Do staff wear uniforms, organizational t-shirts, vests, caps or other forms of identification when conducting program activities?
11. Will the modality for delivery require vulnerable individuals (e.g., women and girls) to travel on their own to access the distribution point, potentially exposing them to SEA in the process?
12. What is the type of location for project (camp, informal settlement, host community, rural/urban setting, etc.)?
13. What are specific risks associated with the location for the program (e.g., lack of availability of mechanisms for prevention and redress, insecurity, traditional justice structures, etc.)?
14. What is the affected community's attitude towards GBV concerns? How comfortable would they be reporting SEA concerns?

## Tools to aid the report writing

### SEA Risk Assessment Risk Factor Prioritization Tool

For use with Step 3

SEA Risk Factor	Likelihood (scale of 1->5)	Impact (scale of 1->5)	Priority (High, Substantial, Moderate, Low)
<i>Example: Lack of gender balance in Country Office, particularly at the senior level</i>	4	2	Moderate
<i>Example: Staff not fully aware of Code of Conduct and expected standards of behavior</i>	4	5	High

5	Yellow	Light Orange	Orange	Dark Orange	Red
4	Light Blue	Yellow	Light Orange	Orange	Dark Orange
3	Light Blue	Yellow	Yellow	Light Orange	Orange
2	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Yellow	Yellow
1	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue	Light Blue
	1	2	3	4	5
	Likelihood				

High
Substantial
Moderate
Low

## SEA Risk Factor Matrix

For use with Step 4

Once you have completed the SEA Risk Situational Analysis (Step 2) and you have identified and prioritized the SEA risk factors (Step 3), you can use the SEA Risk Factor Matrix to list the risk factors and risk responses (mitigation activities), along with assigning responsibility, accountability, and deadlines (if required).

SEA Risk Factor	Risk Response (Mitigation)	Responsible	Accountable	Deadline
<b>Example: Lack of gender balance in Country Office, particularly at the senior level</b>	<b>Senior leadership should work with Human Resources to proactively seek out female candidates for senior level positions, identifying and addressing any issues that might restrict more women from applying</b>	<b>Head of Human Resources</b>	<b>Country Representative</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>Example: Staff not fully aware of Code of Conduct and expected standards of behavior</b>	<b>All staff should be required to undergo PSEA refresher training, either face-to-face or online.</b>	<b>Line managers, Human Resources</b>	<b>Head of Human Resources</b>	<b>June 2022</b>

## Examples of SEA Risk Responses

### Awareness-raising and training

- Measures to increase knowledge of staff on standards of conduct on SEA and how to report SEA such as:
  - mandatory PSEA online training
  - pre-deployment, induction and refresher training
  - internal communications activities
  - requirement for experts/consultants on mission to sign a confirmation letter acknowledging that they understand the standards of conduct and will fulfill their responsibilities in this regard
- Measures to create an organizational culture that is respectful of both women and men such as:
  - provision of gender awareness training
  - messaging from CO leadership
  - regular dialogue between CO leadership and female staff deployed to remote locations with poor gender balance

### Human resources

- Measures to improve gender balance among personnel at all levels
  - Analyse gender balance at all levels of organizations
  - Discuss ways to improve gender balance, including improved recruitment techniques
  - Put in place improvement plan, to be reviewed quarterly
- Conduct thorough background check for new employees, both international and national
  - Many UN Agencies are using Clear Check to vet both international and national staff, so Agency PSEA Focal Points should check with their HR colleagues to ensure international and national staff are being thoroughly checked
  - NGOs are using the Misconduct Disclosure Scheme to vet both international and national staff, so NGO PSEA Focal Points should check with their HR colleagues to ensure that international and national staff are being thoroughly checked
- Ensure that each new member of staff receives an induction discussion/training on PSEA and how to report SEA allegations (preferably from the organizational PSEA Focal Point)

### Accountability, structures, and policies

- Organizational leadership must clearly underline the importance of addressing SEA and the importance of organizational core values by:
  - Sharing the Ethiopia Joint PSEA Strategy with staff
  - Including PSEA as an agenda topic in management meetings
  - Making time to meet and work with the organizational PSEA Focal Points
- Dedicated structures and resources to address SEA such as:
  - Organizational PSEA Focal Points actively participating in the Ethiopia PSEA Network (and/or sub-regional PSEA Networks)
  - Trainers with experience with PSEA training packages (IASC or internal)

- Complaints feedback mechanism (CFM) that includes reporting SEA allegations
- Inclusion of language on addressing PSEA in senior management performance appraisals.
- Where applicable and in collaboration with the UNCT or HCT, policies and procedures that restrict UN and NGO personnel movements and off-duty contact with the local population (e.g. curfews, lists of out-of-bounds areas where prostitution is known or suspected to occur, policy on wearing organization-identifiable clothing at all times while working with the affected population, policy prohibiting certain categories of contractor personnel (e.g. cleaners) being in UN/NGO compounds after working hours or at weekends).
- Measures to restrict access of the population to UN/NGO accommodation/camps of civilian personnel (e.g., restrict the timings when cleaners can be in UN/NGO compounds to minimize contact with organizational staff, liaise with the local authorities to prevent new businesses/dwellings from being erected adjacent to UN/NGO camps/compounds).
- Monitoring and oversight of high-risk locations for SEA (e.g., SEA risk assessment visits, deployment of PSEA Focal Point to high-risk areas, regular visits by senior management to high-risk locations).

#### Safety and security

- Strengthening entry/exit controls into organizational offices/accommodations.

#### Staff welfare and living conditions

- Provision of adequate welfare facilities such as:
  - Internet
  - phone/skype
  - gym
  - outdoor sports
  - indoor games
  - inter-agency sporting competitions
  - food deliveries to remote locations
  - adequate living conditions for all personnel
- Provision of counselling services for all personnel.
- Channeling personal, charitable donations from staff (e.g., food and non-food items) through third party organizations such as NGOs.

#### Complaints mechanism and response

- Establishment of complaints mechanisms for staff and for the population to increase reporting of SEA such as:
  - a. toll-free telephone hotline
  - b. complaint boxes in offices and outside project sites
  - c. community feedback committees
  - d. other methods as appropriate
- External communications on the status and outcome of SEA investigations.

#### Survivor Assistance

- External communications activities targeting the population on risk factors for SEA, organizational standards of conduct on SEA, reporting mechanisms for the population, and assistance available to survivors. This should be done in coordination with other UN agencies and missions, NGOs, local authorities and civil society (e.g., traditional leaders, youth and women groups). Examples of communications activities include:
  - a. radio programs
  - b. community theatre and dance
  - c. pocket cards in local languages on how to report SEA
  - d. signs at distribution points, markets, etc. explaining how staff should behave and how to report SEA allegations
- Establishment of referral mechanisms for survivors of SEA so that survivors are provided with immediate support such as:
  - a. Medical assistance
  - b. Psycho-social assistance
  - c. Legal aid
  - d. Security/protection
  - e. Longer-term support (e.g., skills training, support to return to full-time education).
- Establishment of survivor rights advocates in COs to maintain contact with survivors and assist them to gain access to judicial redress and get feedback on the status of their cases.

#### Interaction with affected communities

- Adapt awareness-raising efforts on SEA, including where and how to report in order to meet specific the needs of affected populations (e.g., language, approaches).
- Consider targeted messaging for those groups that are highly susceptible to SEA. Consult with target groups to ensure communication approaches are relevant and meets their needs.
- Re-adjust gender balance of staff to include more female staff, if required.
- Conduct trainings or refresher trainings on PSEA, using the Ethiopia PSEA Network Training Package.
- Review HR files of staff/personnel and conduct additional screening for previous misconduct, where needed.
- Analyze contextual issues (see below) to ensure interventions do not inadvertently exacerbate existing tensions or vulnerabilities, in line with do no harm and conflict sensitivity approaches.
- Arrange periodic site visits by PSEA focal points, protection staff or other independent observer to monitor possible SEA risks.
- Change location(s) of distribution to make it more public. Where relevant/possible, include local women leaders or community representatives as part of the process. In some cases, specific distribution times and points specifically for women may be considered.
- Identify alternative/additional channels for making complaints safely and confidentially, considering intersectional needs.
- Request staff to wear forms of identification when conducting program activities (and provide such forms of identification where needed).
- Consider providing transportation support to women and girls to access assistance. Or changing the location / modality for delivery of assistance, as required.

- Create a more secure environment at program location (e.g., install lights, ensure locks, hire night guards, etc.)
- Work with communities to adapt feedback and complaints mechanisms to meet their needs. For instance, utilize the results from the nation-wide DTM FGDs completed by the network on reporting and awareness, considering regional needs and differences in Ethiopia.
- In the current COVID context, consider how remote feedback and reporting can be strengthened or introduced in the absence of in-person reporting.



## What Happens Next? After the SEA Risk Assessment

### SEA Risk Assessment Monitoring and Review Tool

For use with step 6

Once the assessment has been conducted, it is important to follow up with monitoring, reviewing further assessments to make sure that the right people are held accountable. Using the SEA Risk Factor matrix from the SEA Risk Assessment report template, review each of the identified risks using the following questions.

1. Are the risks still relevant? Should any new risks be added?
2. Is the list of priority risks still accurate? Have new priority risks emerged? Should any risk be downgraded and no longer be considered a priority?
3. Are the scores for the risks still accurate?
4. Do any severe/high risks need to be escalated to Country Office leadership to address?
5. What is the trend for each risk? Is the risk remaining constant, or is it increasing or decreasing?
6. What is the status of implementation of risk responses? Are they on schedule? Can any risk responses be marked as “completed”?

SEA Risk Factor	Risk Response (Mitigation)	Responsible	Accountable	Deadline

## SEA Risk Assessment Matrix

For use throughout the SEA Risk Assessment Process

Focus	Key points to consider for risk mitigation	Possible Risk Mitigation Measures
<b>Profile of groups receiving assistance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who will directly or indirectly be benefiting from this programme/ intervention (e.g., what is the age, gender, background, status, disabilities, etc.)?</li> <li>What are some of the main characteristics that may render them more susceptible to SEA? Some individuals may have overlapping (inter-sectional) vulnerabilities (e.g., mothers with disabilities, minority women, girls subjected to child marriage, etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adapt awareness-raising efforts on SEA, including where and how to report in order to meet specific the needs of affected populations (e.g., language, approaches).</li> <li>Consider targeted messaging for those groups that are highly susceptible to SEA. Consult with target groups to ensure communication approaches are relevant and meets their needs.</li> </ul>
<b>Profile of personnel involved in the delivery of assistance / services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Which staff/volunteers/contractors are delivering goods and services? Is there an adequate gender balance, particularly for staff directly engaging with affected women and children?</li> <li>Have staff been sufficiently vetted as part of the selection/recruitment process, explained and signed the network-developed Code of Conduct and trained on PSEA, including volunteers?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-adjust gender balance of staff to include more female staff, if required.</li> <li>Conduct trainings or refresher trainings on PSEA, using the Ethiopia PSEA Network Training Package.</li> <li>Review HR files of staff/personnel and conduct additional screening for previous misconduct, where needed.</li> </ul>
<b>Programme activities / interventions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the size and scale of the program? Will the programme or intervention create or exacerbate existing imbalances between program staff and members of the community?</li> <li>Does the program involve direct interaction between staff and children, or other particularly vulnerable groups? (For example, in-kind distributions).</li> <li>How are staff delivering services (e.g., in private or in public)? Will it involve accessing the homes of vulnerable persons?</li> <li>Would there be witnesses in case of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyse contextual issues (see below) to ensure interventions do not inadvertently exacerbate existing tensions or vulnerabilities, in line with do no harm and conflict sensitivity approaches.</li> <li>Arrange periodic site visits by PSEA focal points, protection staff or other independent observer to monitor possible SEA risks.</li> <li>Change location(s) of distribution to make it more public. Where relevant/possible, include</li> </ul>

	<p>an SEA incident? Are staff working in pairs (ideally gender-mixed)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the process for delivering goods and services enable staff and affected people to raise concerns or make complaints in a safe, confidential environment?</li> <li>• Do staff wear uniforms, organizational t-shirts and/or other forms of identification when conducting program activities?</li> <li>• Will the modality for delivery require vulnerable persons (e.g., women and girls) to travel on their own to access the distribution point, potentially requiring the use of various means of accessing and exposing them to SEA in the process?</li> </ul>	<p>local women leaders or community representatives as part of the process. In some cases, specific distribution times and points specifically for women may be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify alternative/additional channels for making complaints safely and confidentially, considering intersectional needs.</li> <li>• Request staff to wear forms of identification when conducting program activities (and provide such forms of identification where needed).</li> <li>• Consider providing transportation support to women and girls to access assistance. Or changing the location / modality for delivery of assistance, as required.</li> </ul>
<b>Context</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the type of location for project (camp, informal settlement, host community, rural/urban setting, etc.)?</li> <li>• What are specific risks associated with the location for the program (e.g., lack of availability of mechanisms for prevention and redress, insecurity, traditional justice structures, etc)?</li> <li>• What is the affected community's attitude towards GBV concerns? How comfortable would they be reporting SEA concerns?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a more secure environment at program location (e.g., install lights, ensure locks, hire night guards, etc.)</li> <li>• Work with communities to adapt feedback and complaints mechanisms to meet their needs. For instance, utilize the results from the nation-wide DTM FGDs completed by the network on reporting and awareness, considering regional needs and differences in Ethiopia.</li> <li>• In the current COVID context, consider how remote feedback and reporting can be strengthened or introduced in the absence of in-person reporting.</li> </ul>