

SEARO

Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Risk Overview

Betav1.1, October 2022

Concept and Methodology

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SEARO is a collaboration of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Secretariat, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office (FCDO). Developed by Craig Williams (UNOCHA) and Maria del Carmen Rodriguez Rodriguez (UNICEF) under the overall supervision of Wendy Cue (IASC/UNOCHA) and Katherine Wepplo (UNICEF).

The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of all SEARO partners. The various dimensions and categories of SEARO are based on expert input from individuals provided during the consultations and during the editing process.

Special thanks to Luca Vernaccini, World Health Organization (WHO) and Andrew Thow, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Action (UNOCHA), for their inputs during the statistical validation of the index.

Thanks also to the members of the SEARO Advisory Group for their guidance:

- Alon Plato, International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA)
- Anais Lafite and Mary Thompson, UK Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office (FCDO)
- Anne-Marie Connor, World Vision (WVI)
- Andrew Thow, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Action (UNOCHA)
- Doris Voorbraak and Janna van Wermeskerken, Department of Stabilization and Humanitarian Aid, Government of the Netherlands
- Elizabeth Pender, USAID, Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance
- Gareth Price-Jones, Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR)
- Katherine Wepplo, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
- Wendy Cue, Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC/UNOCHA) Secretariat

We would like also to acknowledge with a special thanks to the Office of the Special Coordinator on improving UN response to sexual exploitation and abuse (UN OSCSEA) for facilitating access to valuable information.

The work of SEARO is made possible thanks to the support from the UK Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office (FCDO), the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

USE and ATTRIBUTION

Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0): <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>. Reuse is authorised, provided the source is acknowledged.

Citation: SEARO 2022. Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Risk Overview. Concept and methodology

CONTACT INFORMATION

Wendy Cue at the IASC Secretariat (cue@un.org)

Katherine Wepplo at UNICEF (kwepplo@unicef.org)

ABSTRACT

The Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Risk Overview (SEARO) is a Composite Index that brings together indicators on a range of different factors that can influence the risk of SEA. SEARO categorizes countries with ongoing humanitarian response operations according to their level of risk, enabling comparisons of risk between countries and assessing how those risks change over time. SEARO can help IASC members and donors to make more informed use of limited humanitarian resources towards priority issues and countries of concern.

The SEARO Analytical Framework was developed from an initial pool of more than 240 potential risk factors identified through a literature review of 80+ sources and consultation with 28 experts. During the project's research and consultation phase these potential risk factors were reviewed, classified and organised to create the SEARO Analytical Framework.

SEARO comprises four Dimensions and reflects distinct factors of risk that: exist in every country (Enabling Environment); are introduced along with a humanitarian crisis (Humanitarian Context); are introduced along with a humanitarian response operation (Operational Context); and are introduced with specific measures that aim to address SEA (Protective Environment). These dimensions are built on data from credible, publicly available sources, such as UN agencies, governments and multilateral organizations.

This document describes the concept and methodology behind the Beta version 1.1. of SEARO. It contains a detailed description of the conceptual framework of the model, how the model was built and its individual components. The last section includes a description of the indicators, their sources and methods of calculation.

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	4
1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. METHODOLOGY	6
2.1. CONCEPTUAL APPROACH	6
2.2. KEY DESIGN PRINCIPLES	7
2.3. DESIGN PROCESS	7
2.4. STATISTICAL VALIDATION PROCESS AND FINAL REVIEW	8
2.5. METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS	8
3. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK	10
3.1. ENABLING ENVIRONMENT	10
3.2. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT	11
3.3. OPERATIONAL CONTEXT	12
3.4. PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT	12
4. INDICATORS	14
ANNEX 1. LIST OF INCLUSION CRITERIA	27
ANNEX 2. STATISTICAL VALIDATION	28

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CC-COIN	European Union's Competence Centre on Composite Indicators and Scoreboards
CP	Child Protection
DHS	Demographic Health Survey
ERP	Emergency Response Plan
FA	Flash Appeal
FCDO	UK Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office
GBV	Gender-based Violence
GII	Gender Inequality Index
HC	Humanitarian Coordinator
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HDI	Human Development Index
HNO	Humanitarian Needs Overview
HPC	Humanitarian Program Cycle
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OSCSEA	UN Office of the Special Coordinator on improving UN response to SEA
PAPFAM	Pan Arab Project for Family Health Survey
PSEA	Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
RP	Response Plan
SEA	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
SEARO	SEA Risk Overview
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United nations
SDHS	Somali Demographic Health Survey
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UN WOMEN	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
VAWC	Violence Against Women and Children
WB	World Bank
WGI	Worldwide Governance Indicators
WHO	World Health Organization

1. INTRODUCTION

Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA) undermines the aid sector as a whole and limits our collective ability to deliver positive change. SEA is completely unacceptable and actors across the humanitarian sector have dedicated resources to end impunity, appoint dedicated staff, build the sector's capability, develop or refresh standards, support survivors, and put in place systematic and robust reporting mechanisms. To effectively deliver the limited support and resources that are available requires an understanding of country priorities. To address this need, the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office (UK-FCDO), the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), working under the umbrella of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), have developed an evidence-based tool to understand and measure factors that influence the risk of SEA in humanitarian operations.

The SEA Risk Overview (SEARO) is a composite index that combines data into four dimensions that contribute to or mitigate the risk of SEA. Those dimensions are the Enabling Environment - underlying factors common to every country that could exacerbate or alleviate the perpetration of SEA; the Humanitarian Context - risks that are added when a major humanitarian crisis occurs; the Operational Context - additional risks introduced by an international humanitarian response operation; and the Protective Environment - the influence of specific actions taken by the humanitarian system to prevent, reduce, mitigate, identify and address SEA.

SEARO covers countries that have a Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), Emergency Response Plan (ERP), or Flash Appeal (FA)¹ and provides a score from 0 to 10 for each of the model's 4 dimensions, 8 categories and 16 components. The index is to be updated annually, including a revision of sources and indicators.

SEARO aims to provide a common, shared, and informed basis for identifying SEA risks, and for comparing risk across countries and over time. It is intended to help design effective mitigation measures and make the most strategic use of limited humanitarian resources by prioritizing countries of concern for additional allocation of resources, capacity, projects, advocacy and stakeholder dialogue.

The project was initiated in January 2022 and initial results were presented in September 2022. It is an inter-agency effort under the umbrella of the IASC and is led by the UK FCDO, OCHA and UNICEF. An Advisory Group including other donors, UN agencies and INGOs provided subject-matter and technical guidance.

¹ Reference at the [Global Humanitarian Overview 2022](#)

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Conceptual Approach

SEA is a type of Gender Based Violence (GBV) with women and girls being disproportionately affected. SEA is also rooted in the societal norms that perpetuate power differentials between men and women.

SEA exists worldwide and is particularly exacerbated in emergency contexts. Humanitarian actors - international, national, government staff, members of civil society groups, community leaders and any other actor involved in humanitarian operations - have a responsibility to protect civilians but they may as well become perpetrators of this type of violence.

The definition of SEA includes two components:

- Sexual exploitation refers to any actual or attempted abuse of a position of vulnerability, differential power, or trust, for sexual purposes, perpetrated by aid workers against the children and families they serve
- Sexual abuse is the actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, whether by force or under unequal or coercive conditions, perpetrated by aid workers against the children and families they serve

Different forms of SEA include sexual assault, rape, transactional sex, trafficking, child prostitution, and other forms of sexual exploitation and abuse.

The analysis of this type of violence is being restricted by the limited data available. As illustrated in the diagram below, data and information on SEA is under-reported and the assessment of the real size and impact of the problem is not fully understood.



Consequently, the approach taken by the SEARO project to the concept of risk of sexual exploitation and abuse is framed under the need to identify and measure the problem without an objective reference point on how countries are impacted by SEA in reality.

SEARO therefore defines risk as the likelihood of environmental, operational, humanitarian and protective factors contributing and/or mitigating the exposure to SEA.

It is important to note that SEARO does not predict the occurrence of SEA but rather identifies and measures different contributing and protective factors that are thought to increase or reduce the risk of SEA occurring.

2.2. Key Design Principles

The development of SEARO has been guided by the following design principles:

Framework-first: The Analytical Framework is the centerpiece of the project. It contains elements that are shared with other risk analysis tools as well as new elements that have been overlooked or not consistently integrated. The layered design facilitates analysis of a diverse set of risk and protective factors at varying levels of detail, including risks derived directly from a humanitarian crisis and subsequent interventions. The analytical framework also reflects underlying gender and power dynamics that can influence the risk of this particular type of gender-based violence. Overall, the Analytical Framework is presented as a stand-alone product that aspires to be used not only as the conceptual basis of the SEARO composite index, but as the framework for other forms of analysis of SEA.

Streamlined: One benefit of composite indices is their ability to represent complex issues through a relatively small number of indicators (see for example the Human Development Index which includes just four indicators). SEARO has been designed with a limited number of indicators to simplify its maintenance and sustainability, under the principle of including enough indicators to represent each component of the index, but no more than that. In keeping with the 'Framework-first' principle, each of the 16 components is represented by one or two primary indicators, though each such indicator could itself be made up of multiple sub-indicators.

Iterative: The time and resources available for the development of SEARO framed the project and demanded the construction of a tool that has been designed with the best data available at the time of the index's release². The index will be reviewed annually and, where new indicators are available that can better reflect any given component, they will replace the previous indicator. In this way the validity and representation of the index can be improved over time whilst following the 'Framework-first' and 'Streamlined' principles.

2.3. Design Process

A desk review of 80+ sources and consultations with 28 key informants led to the identification of over 240 potential indicators and datasets that were seen as possible contributors of risk³. These factors were organized into an analytical framework comprising four 'dimensions', eight 'categories' and 16 'components'. Based on discussions with the Advisory Group, this analytical framework was seen as a valuable product in its own right, providing a useful way to group, organize and present different facets of SEA risk. Subsequent work on the project therefore aimed to maintain the analytical framework as a product with equal weight to the index itself.

Each of these potential indicators were reviewed against five criteria to evaluate their usability in the model, with an aim to identify at least one viable indicator for each of the 16 'components'. The list of inclusion criteria can be found in Annex 1 below.

That review process initially identified 34 indicators which met the minimum criteria, with the other 200+ potential indicators rejected because they did not meet one or more criteria. These 34 indicators were evaluated in more detail to assess their suitability for the index, including downloading and examining the

² The COVID-19 pandemic has had an impact on information and data gathering exercises worldwide and thus, some data points for 2021 were not updated although it is expected that demographic surveys, GBV national assessments and others will resume, and next iterations of the model will benefit from it.

³ The full list of the 240+ potential indicators is available and can be requested to project developers.

dataset and doing a more in-depth review of the other criteria, a process that further reduced the number of indicators to 26 and eventually to 16, to represent each of the Analytical Framework's 16 components.

Once the conceptual framework of the index was built and the data selection finalized⁴, a SEARO Beta Model was developed. The model used equal weighting and arithmetic average as the selected aggregation methods to align with the design principles of the index. The Beta Model was reviewed internally by members of the Advisory Group and adjustments were done before a statistical validation process.

2.4. Statistical Validation Process and final review

A statistical validation was performed on the draft index using the COIN Tool published by the European Union's Competence Centre on Composite Indicators and Scoreboards (CC-COIN). The statistical validation provided an objective evaluation of the SEARO index, a visualization of its internal consistency and a means to modify, test and refine the index's methodology to improve its robustness⁵. The overall aim of the validation process was to ensure that SEARO respected and reflected the project concept and design principles and presented a balanced set of results with minimal unintended bias. The validation included the 16 components, 8 categories and 4 dimensions of the SEARO index as well as the overall risk score.

A first pass of the COIN Tool found that 10 of the 16 components fell outside one or more a number of preferred statistical ranges. Each of the affected components were explored further to understand the source of the outlying value and, where the cause wasn't inherent to the dataset itself, the formula was adjusted to bring the dataset within the preferred range. After each adjustment the COIN Tool was re-calculated, as a change to any one component would affect correlations with all other components of the model. After several rounds of review and adjustment, all elements of the Beta version fell within preferred ranges, with some minor exceptions, which are summarized in Annex 2. The statistical validation will be repeated at the end of the model's Beta period as part of the finalization of the first full version of SEARO.

2.5. Methodological challenges and limitations

The development of SEARO encountered two main types of constraints related with data limitations and methodological challenges. There are certain areas of the four dimensions that are not covered or covered only partially. These have been identified and are described in Section 4 below to highlight areas for review and improvement in future iterations of the Index⁶.

Data availability. The index relies on country-level secondary data that meets acceptable standards for relevance, coverage, frequency, consistency and quality. In some cases a preferred indicator that would best represent one of the sixteen components was not available and the model instead uses one or more other indicators as the 'best available' solution for representing the component. This is particularly challenging in the field of violence against women and children, where prevalence data remains limited, even more so for certain types of violence relevant for the assessment of SEA such as trafficking in persons, sexual violence and exploitation.

⁴ Data were collected between May and July 2022 for Beta V.1 and during September-October for Beta v.1.1 including two more countries: Kenya and Pakistan.

⁵ A user guide for the COIN Tool is available [here](#).

⁶ A list of potential data points and data sources to be reviewed for future iterations is available and can be requested to project developers.

Data coverage. The SEARO index primarily uses publicly available sources, such as the UN and World Bank. However, some indicators identified by experts as relevant for assessing SEA risk are currently not included in the model due to a lack of geographical coverage for all countries included in the index. This is a common problem when working with datasets in conflict-affected countries where data are often limited and/or outdated. For example, information on the prevalence of female-headed households is not updated for most of the countries with humanitarian crises that have high numbers of displaced population and thus, outdated statistics are not representative of the scale and magnitude of the problem.

Accuracy. It is currently not possible to validate the index through direct comparison with the actual prevalence of SEA, because there is no authoritative dataset on SEA prevalence. Results presented by the index may accurately reflect their individual components, however without an authoritative ground-truthing a cautious interpretation of scores is needed. SEARO can be used to support decisions that require an understanding of the drivers of SEA risk in general terms, and to understand how these risk factors evolve over time in any given response operation but cannot be interpreted as indicative of where actual SEA incidents are occurring.

Validity. The SEARO index is built on a robust theoretical analytical model that comprehensively includes the most relevant categories and components indicating the vulnerability of countries towards SEA. However, data limitations hindered the capacity to include certain indicators that could have increased the representativeness of the model. Future iterations of the index may increase its validity by adding new indicators that contain updated data points and/or additional data sources.

Constantly evolving contexts. Due to the dynamic and chaotic nature of humanitarian emergencies and the lack of a globally systematic approach to data collection, imperfect information is necessarily used in the Index. SEARO is only one source of information that can support decisions about humanitarian crises. It should typically be complemented by other sources and in-country data for a deeper level of analysis.

3. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The SEARO Analytical Framework organises components of risk into a systematic and hierarchical approach. It aims to simplify analysis of SEA risk factors at different levels of detail.

The SEARO Analytical Framework comprises three levels of classification: Dimensions, Categories and Components. The four Dimensions represent the framework's highest level of analysis and reflect distinct aspects of risk that: 1) exist in every country; 2) are introduced along with a humanitarian crisis; 3) are introduced along with a humanitarian response operation; and 4) are introduced with specific measures that aim to address SEA. Each of the four Dimensions are broken down into two Categories, and each of the eight Categories into two Components, to provide additional levels of analytical detail.

SEARO dimensions, categories and components are described below.

Risk of Sexual Exploitation & Abuse																
DIMENSION	Enabling Environment				Humanitarian Context				Operational Context				Protective Environment			
CATEGORY	Policy & Societal Norms		Human Rights & Gender Equality		Crisis Scope & Intensity		Needs Scale & Complexity		Response Institutions		Response Modalities		Capacity & Resources		Mechanisms & Accountability	
COMPONENT	Laws, Policies & Practices	Institutions & Services	Violence Against Women & Children	Gender Inequalities	Crisis Scope & Intensity	Crisis Severity	Operational Size	Operational Complexity	Leadership & Staffing	Organizational Culture & Practices	Operational Design & Management	Operational Reach	Coordination and leadership	Funding and resources	Survivor Assistance	Reporting and Accountability

3.1. Enabling Environment

This dimension reflects factors that exist in every country, whether there is a humanitarian response or not. They are the laws, policies, societal norms and practices that can create an enabling environment for the perpetrators of SEA, increase the vulnerability of women and children to perpetrators, and affect how the society and its institutions and services influence the risk of SEA. The dimension also includes information on the prevalence of underlying factors contributing to SEA such as human rights violations and gender inequalities. The table below describes the Categories and Components of the dimension and the hierarchical relationship among them. Section 4 below provides a detailed definition of each component and their indicators.

Dimension	Enabling Environment							
Categories	Policy and Societal Norms				Human rights and Gender Equality			
Components	Laws, Policies & Practices		Institutions & Services		Violence Against Women & Children			Gender Inequalities
Indicators	Laws & Policies	Social Practices	Corruption Perception	Rule of Law	Violence against women and children			Gender Inequality
Sub-Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is legislation specifically addressing domestic violence - There legislation on sexual harassment in employment - Criminal penalties for sexual harassment in employment - There is legislation specifically addressing sexual violence 	Percentage of women (15-49 years) who consider a husband to be justified in hitting or beating his wife	Corruption Perception	Rule of Law (WGI) Rule of Law (BTI)	Percentage of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older who have experienced physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the previous 12 months	Percentage of women (aged 20-24 years) married or in union before age 18	Proportion of ever-married/partnered women who reported that they had been subjected to one or more acts of physical or sexual violence, or both, by a current or former husband or male intimate partner in their lifetime	Gender inequality index (GII)

3.2. Humanitarian Context

This dimension assesses factors related to the introduction of one or more crises into a country, such as a conflict. The dimension captures the geographic extent, scale and intensity of the crises, as well as the people affected and the severity of needs. These factors aim to reflect the increased risk that comes from large, complex emergencies, as well as from large, complex responses. The larger the scale of the crisis (in terms of geographical coverage and number of people affected) and the higher the impact on peoples' lives (in terms of increasing dependence and vulnerabilities), the higher the risk. Additionally, this dimension also works under the assumption that when humanitarian crises put the security and wellbeing of populations at risk, there is a higher likelihood for SEA.

Dimension	HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT			
Categories	Crisis Scope & Intensity		Needs Scale & Complexity	
Components	Scope & Intensity	Crisis Severity	Operational Size	Operational Complexity
Indicators	People Affected	Conditions of people affected	Funding Requirements	Humanitarian Access
Sub-Indicators	People Affected (Absolute) People Affected (relative to the people in the affected area)	People in need and concentration of conditions	Overall funding Beneficiaries targeted under the current RP	Denial of existence of humanitarian needs or entitlements to assistance Restriction and obstruction of access to services and assistance Impediments to enter the country (bureaucratic and administrative) Restriction of movement within the country Interference into implementation of humanitarian activities. Violence against humanitarian personnel, facilities, and assets. Insecurity or hostilities affecting humanitarian assistance. Presence of landmines improvised explosive devices, explosive remnants of war and unexploded ordnance. Physical constraints in the environment (related to terrain, climate, lack of infrastructure, etc.).

3.3. Operational Context

This dimension reflects how the overall response operation is designed and managed, including types of assistance and how they are delivered and monitored, as well the awareness and commitment of aid workers and humanitarian organizations to prevent, identify and address incidents of SEA. The more sensitive and knowledgeable on the risks of SEA aid agencies and organizations are, the less likely they will perform or accept any act of SEA. Other underlying assumptions for this dimension are related with the type of assistance aid institutions provide. As highlighted by some studies⁷ and experts consulted, types of aid that involve provision of goods (such as food, cash or NFIs) increase the risk of SEA and other types of misconduct performed by aid workers. Additionally, the higher the gaps in funding aid activities, the more likely operations would overlook basic protective mechanisms when distributing aid.

Dimension	OPERATIONAL CONTEXT			
Categories	Response Institutions		Response Modalities	
Components	Leadership & Staffing	Organizational Culture & Practices	Operational design and management	Operational Reach
Indicators	Staff capacities on PSEA	Staff Knowledge of PSEA	Funding for Food, Cash, NFIs	Gaps in Funding and Activities
Sub-Indicators	Proportion of UN staff trained in the last 12 months	Q1: "It is acceptable for UN staff and related personnel to have sex with a sex worker as long as it is legal in the country of the duty station" Q2: "As long as there is consent, it is acceptable for UN staff and related personnel to have a sexual relationship with someone under the age of 18" Q3: "It is my responsibility to report an act of sexual exploitation and abuse by a colleague from my entity" Q4: "It is my responsibility to report an act of sexual exploitation and abuse by an individual employed by another UN entity or UN-affiliated peacekeeping personnel" Q5: "It is my responsibility to report an act of sexual exploitation and abuse by an individual employed by a UN implementing partner, supplier or vendor"	SQRT of most recent funds for cash, food and NFIs Percentage of total funds earmarked for cash, food & NFI	Gap in funding of the appeal in the previous year's RP Gap in people targeted and reached in the overall response from the previous year

3.4. Protective Environment

This dimension reflects the specific capacities and protective measures that are put in place to reduce, identify and address incidents of SEA. The higher the capacities identified, the lesser the risk of SEA. Unlike the rest of the dimensions, the higher the results on its components, the lower the risk of SEA -although the index has normalized scores so high scores indicate high risk. The protective environment is seen as the structures and resources in place to mitigate the impact and prevent the occurrence of SEA. The dimension also assumes that the better the accountability systems in place to report any incident of SEA and the higher access to services for the victims/survivors, the lower the risk of perpetuating SEA.

⁷ See the Empowered Aid Project from the Global Women's Institute

Dimension	PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT				
Categories	Capacity and resources			Mechanisms and Accountability	
Components	Coordination & Leadership		Funding & Resources	Survivor Assistance	Reporting & Accountability
Indicators	Inter-agency Coordination	Inter-agency Structure	RP funds allocated to GBV and Child Protection	Victim / Survivor Access to Dedicated Resources	Interagency Reporting mechanisms
Sub-Indicators	<p>is a coordinator present</p> <p>what is their seniority</p> <p>how much of their time is dedicated to inter-agency coordination</p> <p>what type of contract do they have</p> <p>what's the duration of their deployment</p> <p>have they received PSEA coordination training</p>	<p>Is there a PSEA Network in place with clear TORs</p> <p>Is the Network formally led by co-chairs</p> <p>Is the Network formally lead or supported by a PSEA Coordinator</p> <p>Has an Action Plan been submitted to the OSCSEA (2021)?</p>	<p>Percentage of funds in the Response Plan earmarked for GBV and Child Protection</p>	<p>Percentage of cases referred for survivor assistance in the previous year</p>	<p>Status of development and implementation of SOPs (or similar) across the HCT for prompt, safe and survivor-centered investigations</p> <p>SEA information sharing SOPs including quality criteria</p> <p>Reports on allegations have been shared in 2021</p>

4. INDICATORS

Dimension	1. ENABLING ENVIRONMENT	
Category	1.1. Policy & Societal Norms The category includes factors related with the policy and legal environment, as well as social and cultural beliefs related with gender violence and gender norms.	
Component	1.1.1. Laws, Policies & Practices The component considers the rule of law, existing policies and how protected women and children are by this legislation from violence. The component also includes indicators related to social and gender norms and practices that might be perpetuating violence, such as the justification of domestic violence.	
Indicators	1.1.1.1. Laws and Policies and 1.1.1.2. Social practices	
Description	This component comprises two indicators to reflect both laws and policies as well as practices. The first measures whether four pieces of legislation protecting women rights are in place in the country: legislation addressing domestic violence; legislation addressing sexual harassment in employment; criminal penalties for sexual harassment in employment; and legislation addressing sexual violence. The second reflects societal practices through the assessment of attitudes of the population (women in this case) on whether it is justified for a husband to beat his wife. The two subcomponents are equally weighted	
Source	Laws & Policies: World Bank Gender Data Portal ; UNWOMEN Global Database on Violence Against Women Social Practices: Demographic Health Survey (DHS), Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS)	
Method	Laws & Policies: Three binary indicators (Yes/No), equally weighted 1) There is legislation specifically addressing domestic violence 2) There is legislation on sexual harassment in employment 3) There are criminal penalties for sexual harassment in employment 4) There is legislation addressing sexual violence Social Practices: Percentage of women (aged 15-49 years) who consider a husband to be justified in hitting or beating his wife The two subcomponents are equally weighted. If data are missing for social practices, a score is imputed by taking the average score of countries sharing the same score from the first sub-component on laws and policies. Values below 1.0 are set to 1.0.	
Relevance	Meets	No significant concerns
Coverage	Partial	World Bank and UNWOMEN data are available for all countries. Data on Percentage of women (aged 15-49 years) who consider a husband to be justified in hitting or beating his wife are available for 29/33 countries; missing values imputed
Frequency	Partial	World Bank data from 2021. DHS/MICS surveys are not conducted yearly; current data ranges from 2010 to 2020
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Partial	Laws and Policies: Manually entered from data downloaded from the World Bank portal and UN Women global database on violence against women. Some data gaps required manual data collection and imputation for data for three countries.
Notes	The component could be enhanced by strengthening the ‘Social Practices’ component. A data point such as ‘Perceptions of safety by women and girl’ is to be considered if data quality/coverage allows.	

Component	1.1.2. Institutions & Services This component reflects the strength of legal systems and the credibility and diversity of security forces.	
Indicators	1.1.2.1. Corruption perception and 1.1.2.2. Rule of Law	
Description	<p>The component reflects the strength of legal instruments and systems using the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) dataset, as well as a measure of corruption from the Corruption Perception index. The component includes three sub-indicators:</p> <p>1) Corruption Perceptions Index by Transparency International measures how corrupt each country's public sector is perceived to be, according to experts and businesspeople.</p> <p>2) Rule of Law (WGI) is a constructed measure by the Worldwide Governance Indicators defined as "Rule of law captures perceptions of the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society, and in particular the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence"</p> <p>3) Rule of Law (BTI) based on the index by the Bertelsmann Transformation Index (2022). It combines information on the extent to which political power is separated, the judiciary is independent, office abuse is prosecuted, and civil rights are enforced.</p>	
Source	INFORM Severity : 'Rule of Law' component	
Method	Scores from the three sub-indicators from INFORM Severity are arithmetically averaged, producing a potential range of values from 0 to 5.0. The data are Min-Max normalized using a 1.0 to 5.0 range. Values below 1.0 and set to 1.0.	
Relevance	Meets	No significant concerns
Coverage	Meets	Covers all SEARO countries
Frequency	Meets	Overall model is updated monthly
Quality	Meets	High, with transparent methodology and country-level reliability score
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Meets	SEARO links directly to an Excel spreadsheet made publicly available by the INFORM project

Category	1.2. Human Rights & Gender Equality The category analyzes the existence of different forms of Violence against women and children (VAWC) as well as gender inequalities.	
Component	1.2.1. Violence Against Women & Children This component includes indicators examining the prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) and child marriage. In future versions of the index, when data are available, it is recommended that other sub-indicators reflecting different types of violence against women and children such as sex trafficking and sexual violence are included.	
Indicator	1.2.1.1. Violence against women and children	
Description	This component combines three sub-indicators. The first is the percentage of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older who have experienced physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner, in the previous 12 months. The second measures the percentage of women (aged 20-24 years) married or in union before age 18. The third one includes WHO estimation of lifetime physical and/or sexual intimate partner violence defined as the proportion of ever-married/partnered women who reported that they had been subjected to one or more acts of physical or sexual violence, or both, by a current or former husband or male intimate partner in their lifetime (15- 49 years old).	
Source	Intimate Partner Violence (IPV): WHO Global Estimates on the Prevalence of Violence against Women ; Underage marriage: UNICEF Data Portal based on demographic surveys such as Demographic Health Survey (DHS), Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS)	
	In the case of Lebanon, since no recent national household survey available, data has been extracted from	

	<p>the IMAGES (International men and gender equality survey) by UNWOMEN and PROMUNDO on the 'Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls subjected to sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age (%) Age: 15-49'</p> <p>In the case of Libya, data is extracted from the Pan Arab Project for Family Health Survey (PAPFAM) 2014</p> <p>For Somalia, the Somali Health Demographic Survey, 2020 (SHDS) indicator on 'Percentage of ever-married women aged 15-49 who have experienced specific types of spousal violence by types of injuries resulting from the violence, according to whether they ever experienced violence or experienced it in the 12 months preceding the survey'</p> <p>For Syria, data is extracted from a recent study published on the Journal of Global Health Report</p> <p>For Venezuela, since there is no official data available, the overall estimate for Latin America and the Caribbean is being used as a proxy (United Nations Children's Fund, A Profile of Child Marriage and Early Unions in Latin America and the Caribbean, UNICEF, New York, 2019.)</p>	
Method	<p>Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) violence: Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls subjected to physical and/or sexual violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age (%) Age: 15-49. Values MIN-MAX normalized using MIN(0) and MAX 25%.</p> <p>Lifetime physical and/or sexual intimate partner violence by age (%) 15-49. Values MIN-MAX normalized using MIN(0) and MAX 50%.</p> <p>Underage marriage. Proportion of women aged 20-24 years who were married or in a union before age 18. Values MIN-MAX normalized using MIN(0) and MAX 75%.</p> <p>Index calculated using arithmetic average of the three sub-indicators.</p>	
Relevance	Meets	No significant concerns
Coverage	Partial	WHO data available for 26/33 countries; UNICEF data available in 30/33 countries
Frequency	Partial	Latest data available from 2018 for IPV. For Child marriage data ranges from 2010 to 2020
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Partial	Inter-Agency Group on Violence against Women Data based on (1) specialized national surveys dedicated to measuring violence against women and (2) international household surveys that include a module on experiences of violence by women, such as the DHS. Some data gaps addressed through manual data collection and imputation from nationally representative studies.
Notes	<p>The component would benefit from data from 'Child sexual exploitation and abuse' sub-indicator if quality and availability is ensured. Data on prevalence of sexual trafficking or human trafficking has been also consistently mentioned by experts consulted.</p>	

Component	1.2.2. Gender Inequalities Reflects the existing inequalities based on gender in different areas such as economics, social, labor and education.
Indicator	1.2.2.1. Gender Inequality
Description	Measures gender inequality using the gender inequality index (GII) published by UNDP as part of the Human Development Report (HDR), a composite measure reflecting inequality in achievements between women and men in three dimensions: reproductive health, empowerment and the labor market.
Source	UNDP Gender Inequality Index (GII) 2021/22

Method	The GII source index scales from 0.0 to 1.0 and is normalized by a simple multiplication by 10. Scores below 1.0 are assigned a value of 1.0. Missing values are first imputed by taking the average values of the two countries immediately above and below the missing countries in the overall HDI ranking. Any remaining missing values are imputed by taking the average value of the two countries with the closest matching values in matching sub-indicators.	
Relevance	Meets	High. Gender inequality in income, health, empowerment and the labour market
Coverage	Meets	Index covers most SEARO countries. Includes imputation of values for Libya, Madagascar, Nigeria and Palestine using the average scores of countries with similar HDI rankings. The value for Somalia is calculated through closest matches with available sub-indicators
Frequency	Meets	No significant concerns
Quality	Meets	High
Consistency	Meets	High
Collection	Meets	GI data can be freely downloaded from the HDR website
Notes	HDI data is to be updated by the end of 2022, latest scores in the three dimensions of the index should be used. Inclusion, justice and security index include some other sub-components representing existing inequalities in countries if data quality/coverage is ensured.	

Dimension	2. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT	
Category	2.1. Crisis Scope & Intensity The first component measures the geographic extent of crises, the intensity of any conflict and the exposure of people living in the affected area.	
Component	2.1.1. Scope & Intensity Reflects the geographic scope of the crisis as well as the number of people in the affected area, including those who are considered at higher risk from perpetrators of SEA	
Indicators	2.1.1.1. People Affected	
Description	The component measures the absolute number of people directly affected by the crisis, and the relative number of people directly affected as a proportion of the population living in the affected area through the INFORM Severity component as sub-indicators: People Affected (absolute), based on the total population living in the affected area), and; People living in the affected area relative, based on the percentage of population living in the affected area on the total population of the country.	
Source	Affected People: INFORM Severity : 'Human' Category, 'People Affected' Component	
Method	People Affected: The INFORM Severity model uses a 0-5 scale. The data are Min-Max normalized using a 1.0 to 5.0 range. Values below 1.0 are set to 1.0.	
Relevance	Meets	The overall number of people affected as an absolute and relative number is important to establish the scope of potential victims. Initially a second sub-indicator was used to measure vulnerable households, in the form of percentages of female-headed households, however the available data were not deemed reliable enough to use but this may be a target for future revisions of the index.
Coverage	Meets	INFORM Severity covers all SEARO countries
Frequency	Partial	INFORM Severity model is updated monthly.
Quality	Meets	INFORM: High, with transparent methodology and country-level reliability score
Consistency	Partial	
Collection	Partial	SEARO links directly to an Excel spreadsheet made publicly available by the INFORM project

Notes	A sub-component including data on high-risk populations such as 'female-headed households' and 'unaccompanied minors' should be considered if data coverage and frequency is ensured.
-------	---

Component	2.1.2. Crisis Severity Aims to reflect the number of affected people and the level of severity, on the basis that those with more severe needs are at higher risk from perpetrators of SEA.	
Indicator	2.1.2.1. Conditions of People Affected	
Description	This indicator uses one of the dimensions of the INFORM severity model to reflect the number of people affected and the conditions of those people, measured through five categories: minimal, stressed, moderate, severe and extreme	
Source	INFORM Severity : 'Conditions of people affected' dimension. Underlying data are compiled from a range of sources including Humanitarian Response Plans (HRP), Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNO), the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC), Humanitarian Data Exchange, and individual agency appeals and data platforms	
Method	Scores from INFORM Severity have a potential range of values from 0 to 5.0 but an actual range of 3.1 to 5.0. To increase the spread of values and avoid a clustering of values at the high end of the range, the data are normalized using MIN (2.0) and MAX (5.0)	
Relevance	Meets	High
Coverage	Meets	Covers all SEARO countries. No data gaps in most recent published dataset
Frequency	Meets	Overall INFORM-Severity model is updated monthly, with underlying indicators updated as new data becomes available
Quality	Meets	High, with transparent methodology and country-level reliability score
Consistency	Meets	High
Collection	Meets	SEARO links directly to an Excel spreadsheet made publicly available by the INFORM project

Category	2.2. Needs Scale & Complexity This category measures severity, based on the number of people with different levels of need	
Component	2.2.1. Operational Size Reflects the overall size of the response operation, as larger operations involve larger numbers of humanitarian workers, larger volumes of aid and therefore greater opportunities for interactions between perpetrators and beneficiaries	
Indicator	2.2.1.1. Funding Requirements	
Description	This indicator will blend two sub-indicators from Humanitarian Insight: overall funding and beneficiaries targeted under the current response plan. If figures for a current year plan are unavailable, the prior year's HRP is used. Taken together, these data points reflect the overall scale of the response operation and serve as a proxy for the number of humanitarian workers that will be involved and the number of potential interactions between aid workers and beneficiaries	
Source	OCHA: Humanitarian Insight / HPC Tools	
Method	Overall funding and target beneficiaries are both Square Root (SQRT) transformed to reduce relative weighting as the size of the response plan increased. These score and then Min-Max normalized using a MIN(0) and a MAX SQRT value set at \$5b in funding and 20 million people targeted. These values are arithmetically averaged using a minimum value of 2.0. Values above 9.9 are set to 9.9.	
Relevance	Meets	High, represents overall scale of the response and acts as a proxy for the number of humanitarian staff
Coverage	Meets	Covers all SEARO countries

Frequency	Meets	Data are updated annually
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Meets	Currently the data are requested from the HPC Tools team in OCHA and received via spreadsheet. It should be possible to setup an API if necessary to automate the process

Component	2.2.2. Operational Complexity Reflects factors that can increase the complexity of the response operation related to transportation, communications, security and access. Such impediments can force higher reliance on remote management, increase isolation and undermine monitoring	
Indicator	2.2.2.1. Humanitarian Access	
Description	The 'Humanitarian Access' indicator from the INFORM Severity model is used, which is itself derived from the 'Humanitarian Access Overview' published by ACAPS. The data reflect different aspects of physical access and security that affect the ability of humanitarian workers to access populations in need as well as those populations to reach aid. These Sub-indicators include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denial of existence of humanitarian needs or entitlements to assistance • Restriction and obstruction of access to services and assistance • Impediments to enter the country (bureaucratic and administrative) • Restriction of movement within the country • Interference into implementation of humanitarian activities. • Violence against humanitarian personnel, facilities, and assets. • Insecurity or hostilities affecting humanitarian assistance. • Presence of landmines improvised explosive devices, explosive remnants of war and unexploded ordnance. • Physical constraints in the environment (related to terrain, climate, lack of infrastructure, etc.). 	
Source	INFORM Severity : 'Humanitarian Access' component. Underlying data managed by ACAPS through their 'Humanitarian Access Overview'	
Method	Score is derived from nine sub-indicators with individual ratings on a 0-3 scale. Whilst INFORM groups and averages these sub-indicators to produce a 0-5 scale, SEARO sums all 9 sub-indicators and derives a score based on MIN-MAX normalization where the MIN and MAX are the lowest and highest possible scores within the array. Because the INFORM array includes different values for one country with multiple crises, the formula uses the 'MAX(IF)' formula to find the highest value for each country	
Relevance	Meets	High. Insecurity and constraints to physical access can increase risks of SEA in several ways.
Coverage	Meets	Covers all SEARO countries
Frequency	Meets	Overall INFORM-Severity model is updated monthly. Most recent update of the underlying data on humanitarian access is from July 2021
Quality	Meets	High, with transparent methodology and country-level reliability score
Consistency	Meets	High
Collection	Meets	SEARO links directly to an Excel spreadsheet made publicly available by the INFORM project

Dimension	3. OPERATIONAL CONTEXT	
Category	3.1. Response Institutions Reflects gender balance in leadership and the operation overall, training and recruitment practices related to PSEA, as well as working conditions and institutional culture	
Component	3.1.1. Leadership & Staffing Reflects the commitment of organizations to recruit and train staff on PSEA. The leadership element of the	

	component is recommended to be considered in future versions of the model once data are available	
Indicator	3.1.1.1. Staff capacities on PSEA	
Description	<p>This indicator measures the estimated percentage of staff at UN agencies that have received training on PSEA in the last 12 months. The data is gathered by the UN Office of Special Coordinator and rely on responses from self-assessment questionnaires distributed to staff every year.</p> <p>An annual survey on facts and perceptions of UN personnel related to the prohibitions of sexual exploitation and abuse includes the following question:</p> <p>“Over the last 12 months, I received training on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse. “Induction” implies that you have arrived at that duty station within the last 12 months while “Refresher” means that you have spent more than 12 months in the same duty station (Select one):”.</p> <p>Three possible answers are provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Induction training 2) Refresher training 3) No training in the past 12 months <p>The indicator measures the percentage of total respondents who answered "no training in the past 12 months"</p>	
Source	UN Office of Special Coordinator on PSEA	
Method	A base of 3.0 is used for countries with 0% of respondents reporting that they have not received training in the past 12 months. A secondary value of up to 7.0 is normalized using MIN(0) and MAX(0.5) . This leads to an increasing score as countries report higher levels of respondents who have not received training, with the maximum score of 9.9 applied to countries where more than 50% of respondents have reported not receiving training.	
Relevance	Meets	The indicator reflects the prevalence of PSEA training among UN staff and provides a useful comparison with 3.1.2. to gauge the correlation between training and knowledge
Coverage	Meets	The dataset covers 118 countries and territories, including all SEARO countries
Frequency	Meets	Annual
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	Question format is consistent across agencies and countries
Collection	Meets	The source dataset is provided on request by the UN Office of the Special Coordinator. Producing the index score from the source data requires a low level of data cleaning, normalization and validation,
Notes	<p>Underlying data will not be shared in the public SEARO release at the request of the UN for reasons of data privacy</p> <p>A sub-component on leadership such as ‘HCT adopting IASC PSEA leading function’ is to be considered if data quality is ensured. Additionally, a data point with data from Implementing partners capacities on PSEA is to be considered if data coverage is ensured.</p>	

Component	3.1.2. Organizational Culture & Practices Reflects knowledge, attitudes and practices of humanitarian staff as well as working conditions that could influence SEA risk	
Indicator	3.1.2.1. Staff Knowledge of PSEA	
Description	<p>This indicator measures knowledge of PSEA among UN staff. The data is gathered by the UN Office of Special Coordinator and relies on responses from self-assessment questionnaires distributed to UN staff every year.</p> <p>An annual survey on facts and perceptions of UN personnel related to the prohibitions of sexual exploitation and abuse includes the following questions:</p>	

	<p>Q1: "It is acceptable for UN staff and related personnel to have sex with a sex worker as long as it is legal in the country of the duty station",</p> <p>Q2: "As long as there is consent, it is acceptable for UN staff and related personnel to have a sexual relationship with someone under the age of 18",</p> <p>Q3: "It is my responsibility to report an act of sexual exploitation and abuse by a colleague from my entity",</p> <p>Q4: "It is my responsibility to report an act of sexual exploitation and abuse by an individual employed by another UN entity or UN-affiliated peacekeeping personnel"; and</p> <p>Q5: "It is my responsibility to report an act of sexual exploitation and abuse by an individual employed by a UN implementing partner, supplier or vendor".</p> <p>The indicator measures the percentage of staff that provide an incorrect answer to any of the five questions.</p>	
Source	UN Office of Special Coordinator on PSEA	
Method	The five questions are equally weighted. A base of 3.0 is used for countries where 100% of respondents report all basic questions on SEA correctly. A secondary value of up to 7.0 is calculated using a MIN-MAX calculation with the MIN score set to 0 and MAX set to 0.15. This leads to an increasing score as countries report higher levels of respondents who answer basic questions on SEA incorrectly, with a maximum score applied to countries where more than 15% of answers are incorrect.	
Relevance	Meets	The indicator reflects knowledge of PSEA among UN staff and provides a useful comparison with 3.1.1. to gauge the correlation between training and knowledge
Coverage	Meets	The dataset covers 118 countries and territories, including all SEARO countries
Frequency	Meets	Annual
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	Question format is consistent across agencies and countries
Collection	Meets	The source dataset is provided on request by the UN Office of the Special Coordinator. Producing the index score from the source data requires a low level of data cleaning, normalization and validation.
Notes		Underlying data will not be shared in the public SEARO release at the request of the UN for reasons of data privacy

Category	3.2. Response Modalities Relates to the design of the response operation and how aid is managed, delivered and monitored, as well as operational reach, measured by funding and people reached against targets
Component	3.2.1. Operational Design & Management Reflects how the design of a response may influence SEA risk, including through use of modalities that are transactional (food, cash, NFI), a dependency on remote distribution or a complex web of implementing partners
Indicator	3.2.1.1. Funding for Food, Cash and NFI
Description	This indicator uses the proportion of the response plan earmarked for distribution of commodities as a proxy to highlight those response operations that rely on transactional goods and commodities that could increase opportunities for perpetrators to make demands on beneficiaries. This indicator uses an assumption that commodities and physical aid supplies (such as food, cash, and non-food items) lead to a higher incidence of SEA than social services (such as training, building of social infrastructure, etc.). Thus, this indicator measures total funds earmarked for cash, food and non-food items as well as the percentage of the response plan earmarked for these activities.
Source	OCHA: Humanitarian Insight / HPC Tools . Data are captured on the Humanitarian Insight platform based on planning figures from relevant response plans

Method	The calculation uses total funds requested and, of that, funds earmarked for cash, food and non-food items. If data are not available for the current RP, the prior RP is used. Two sub-indicators are used. The first uses a SQRT of total funds requested for food, cash & NFI indexed using MIN (0) and a MAX score equal to the SQRT of \$1bn. The second sub-indicator calculates the percentage of total funds earmarked for cash, food & NFI which is normalized using MIN(0) and MAX(0.8). The two sub-indicators are arithmetically averaged to produce the index score.	
Relevance	Meets	High
Coverage	Meets	Covers all SEARO countries
Frequency	Meets	Data are updated annually
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Meets	Data are requested from the HPC Tools team in OCHA and received via spreadsheet. Producing the index score from the source data requires a low level of data cleaning, normalization and validation. It should be possible to setup an API if necessary to automate the process

Component	3.2.2. Operational Reach Reflects to what extent the aid effort is meeting its objectives by measuring funds received against those requested and people reach versus those targeted for assistance. Gaps in funding and people reached increase the vulnerability of people in need and their higher exposure to risk.	
Indicator	3.2.2.1. Gaps in Funding and Activities	
Description	This indicator will blend two data points from Humanitarian Insight: 1) the gap in funding in the previous year's RP and 2) the gap in people targeted and reached in the overall response from the previous year. Taken together, these indicators reflect the extent to which the humanitarian community has the funds to implement its programs and the ability to reach those targeted for assistance.	
Source	OCHA: Humanitarian Insight / HPC Tools	
Method	The component uses two sub-indicators. The first calculates the percentage of the appeal that has been funded, using a SQRT function to narrow the range between large outliers. A base value of 5.0 is given to RPs that are fully funded, with the score decreasing towards 0.0 if an RP is over-funded and increasing towards 9.9 if it is under-funded. The second sub-indicator calculates the percentage of people targeted that were reached in the prior year's RP, using a similar approach to the funding sub-component. A missing value, where no appeal was issued in the previous year, is set at 5.0.	
Relevance	Meets	In the absence of specific data on PSEA funding gaps, these indicators serve as a proxy of the resourcing of activities under the response plan and the overall ability of the response community to implement planned activities and reach those in need
Coverage	Meets	Covers all SEARO countries
Frequency	Meets	Data are updated annually
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Meets	Currently the data are requested from the HPC Tools team in OCHA and received via spreadsheet. It should be possible to setup an API if necessary to automate the process

Dimension	4. PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT
Category	4.1. Capacity & Resources Reflects PSEA related structures and mechanisms in place to respond and prevent SEA

Component	4.1.1. Coordination & Leadership Includes indicators related to inter-agency coordination and PSEA structures. Reflects to what extent there are inter-agency structures in place for PSEA.	
Indicator	4.1.1.1. Inter-agency Structure & 4.1.1.2. Inter-agency Coordination	
Description	<p>The component comprises two sub-indicators. The first represents the existence of an inter-agency PSEA structure through the presence of a <i>PSEA Network</i>. The second will represent inter-agency coordination through the presence of a PSEA coordinator' in-country. The presence and engagement of both are considered to be important, minimum factors to building and maintaining inter-agency commitment and action on PSEA</p> <p>An interim indicator is used for 2022, pending revision of the annual PSEA mapping survey. The indicator represents two aspects of coordination & leadership: the presence of a PSEA Coordinator and the existence of a PSEA Network and action plans.</p> <p>PSEA Network is measured through three elements evaluated through the 2021 Annual survey conducted by UNICEF, on behalf of the IASC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is there a PSEA Network in place with clear TORs; 2) Is the Network formally led by co-chairs; 3) Is the Network formally lead or supported by a PSEA Coordinator. The revision of the PSEA mapping survey is expected to add more detail to this question in future. 4) Has an Action Plan been submitted to the OSCSEA (2021)? <p>PSEA Coordinator is measured through six elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is a coordinator present, 2) What is their seniority, 3) How much of their time is dedicated to inter-agency coordination, 4) What type of contract do they have, 5) What's the duration of their deployment, and 6) Have they received PSEA coordination training. Ideally, a country would have a senior, trained PSEA coordinator on a fixed-term contract extended into the following calendar year who is dedicated 100% to inter-agency PSEA. 	
Source	Annual survey conducted by the IASC Secretariat with support from UNICEF; PSEA Coordinator database	
Method	The component has a base score of 4.0 if all conditions are met, with the score increasing as requirements for the PSEA network or a PSEA Coordinator are not met	
Relevance	Meets	Highly relevant as the network is the primary mechanism for inter-agency leadership and coordination on PSEA and the PSEA Coordinator is a key position to support the network
Coverage	Meets	PSEA Networks: Network data were obtained from the 2021 survey which included 24 of 33 countries, with missing data gathered directly from field staff PSEA Coordinators: An OCHA-managed database on PSEA coordinators provided all data on Coordinators and was updated as of May 2022.
Frequency	Meets	PSEA Network: Annual, with 2021 data gathered in Q2/Q3 and published in Q3. Data collection for 2022 ongoing as of Q2 PSEA Coordinator: ad-hoc as information changed
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Partial	Data for the interim indicator are mostly available with gaps filled through contact with the field. This component is expected to be revised along with the annual PSEA mapping survey, at which point data will be collected through that process
Notes	<p>Underlying data will not be shared in the public SEARO release at the request of the UN for reasons of data privacy.</p> <p>Other data points on the status of the PSEA network and its functionality are to be considered.</p>	

Component	4.1.2. Funding & Resources Reflects funding and resources specifically on PSEA, including staffing and funding of a dedicated work plan / action plan if available	
Indicator	4.1.2.1. RP funds allocated to GBV and Child Protection	
Description	<i>Percentage of funds in the Response Plan earmarked for GBV and Child Protection</i> is used as the sole indicator for this component. The scale of funding requested for GBV and Child Protection acts as a proxy for the commitment of the humanitarian system to address GBV. We recommend working towards obtaining a dataset on specific funding for PSEA and swapping that indicator into the model once available The indicator measures relative funding for GBV and Child Protection activities within the overall response plan. A higher proportion of funding for these protection activities is considered a positive sign for resourcing of GBV-related activities.	
Source	OCHA: Humanitarian Insight / HPC Tools	
Method	The component has a base score of 4.0 if funding for GBV and Child Protection exceeds 10% of the overall response plan. The score increases as relative funding for GBV and Child Protection decreases. If data for the current RP are not available, the prior RP is used.	
Relevance	Meets	In the absence of reliable data on PSEA funding for all agencies at country-level this indicator would act as a proxy indicator on the level of support for SEA-related activities
Coverage	Meets	Covers all SEARO countries
Frequency	Meets	Data are updated annually
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Meets	Currently the data are requested from the HPC Tools team in OCHA and received via spreadsheet. It should be possible to setup an API if necessary to automate the process
Notes	This proxy indicator is to be replaced by the actual coverage of PSEA funds to the needs identified for the inter-agency under the PSEA Action Plan. Additionally, a sub-component on 'agency' with data on representativeness and participation of HCT members on the inter-agency PSEA Network is to be considered.	

Category	4.2. Mechanisms & Accountability Reflects PSEA in-country operations and existing protection mechanisms	
Component	4.2.1. Survivor Assistance Reflects current access to assistance and services that are in place to support survivors	
Indicator	4.2.1.1. Victim / Survivor Access to Dedicated Resources	
Description	This indicator captures the actual access to GBV services by SEA victims. The data is collected by UN agencies and their implementing partners through the UN reporting channels on allegations. The system records data on "assistance rendered". In 2021, 26 (out of 126) reported the type of assistance provided to the victim (legal, medical, psychosocial, etc).	
Source	i-REPORT SEA tracker / UN PSEA Database Webportal. The data is open and available at the UN website and updated monthly but not disaggregated by country. Disaggregated data are obtained by request from the UN. The index is calculated as the percentage of cases referred for survivor assistance for which the status is unknown, representing the extent to which cases for survivor assistance are settled and reported as settled. A high score indicates either a lack of progress on deciding assistance or a lack of reporting on status.	
Method	The component is calculated as cases with an unknown status as a percentage of cases. The component has a base score of 4.0 if all cases have a known status, with the score increasing along with cases where the status is unknown.	
Relevance	Meets	Very relevant

Coverage	Meets	No significant concerns
Frequency	Meets	Monthly
Quality	Partial	The system is built on “allegations” and case management of those allegations, not victims.
Consistency	Meets	No significant concerns
Collection	Meets	Aggregated data are available publicly. Data disaggregated by country-level is available upon request
Notes	<p>Underlying data will not be shared in the public SEARO release at the request of the UN for reasons of data privacy.</p> <p>Additional data points on access to dedicated resources such as the ‘Number and Percentage of SEA victims/survivors/complainants who have been promptly referred to assistance’ are to be considered with data from the IASC PSEA Mapping exercise if data coverage is ensured.</p>	

Component	4.2.2. Reporting & Accountability Reflects the existence of reporting mechanisms and the effectiveness of those mechanisms in identifying and responding to allegations	
Indicator	4.2.2.1. Interagency Reporting mechanisms	
Description	<p>This indicator is derived from the annual PSEA mapping survey conducted by UNICEF, on behalf of the IASC, assessing the existence of inter-agency reporting mechanisms in place, using three sub-indicators:</p> <p>1) Status of development and implementation of PSEA SOPs across the HCT for prompt, safe and survivor-centered investigations.</p> <p>2) SEA information sharing SOPs Complying with quality criteria.</p> <p>3) Reports on allegations have been shared in 2021.</p> <p>Ideally, there will be one PSEA SOPs in the country, being implemented and supported by the UCT/HCT, meeting five (out of five) quality criteria and having shared reports on allegations already in 2021.</p>	
Source	IASC PSEA Mapping Exercise / IASC HCT Mapping	
Method	<p>The component has a base score of 4.0 if reporting systems are in place and shared. The score increases as elements of information sharing protocols are absent based on the following sub-indicators:1) Q.76. What is the status of development and implementation of SOPs (or similar) across the HCT for prompt, safe and survivor-centered investigations? (Implemented = 1, Endorsed by HCT = 0.8, Ongoing = 0.6, Under development = 0.4)</p> <p>2) Q.34 SEA information sharing SOPs include: What anonymized information is to be shared; By Whom should the information be shared; How often the information should be shared; For Which purpose the information will be shared; How to safely store information shared (5/5 criteria = 1.0, 4/5 criteria = 0.75, 3/5 criteria = 0.5, 1 or 2/5 criteria = 0.25, no criteria = 0)</p> <p>3) Q.49. Number of allegations reported to the PSEA Network per month, please present by month (from September 2020 to March 2021): (Yes = 1, No = 0)</p>	
Relevance	Meets	Relevant
Coverage	Partial	2021 PSEA survey included 24 of 33 countries
Frequency	Meets	Annual. 2021 data gathered in Q2/Q3 and published in Q3. Data collection for 2022 ongoing as of Q2
Quality	Meets	No significant concerns.
Consistency	Partial	Information on existence of referral pathways and SOPs is not available for all respondents, information to be completed manually (direct contact with countries)

Collection	Partial	Data for the interim indicator are mostly available with gaps. This component is expected to be revised along with the annual PSEA mapping survey, at which point data will be collected through that process
Notes	Additional data points on 'existing inter agency reporting mechanisms in place' such as the 'Percentage of allegations reported to the PSEA Network per month and responded to within seven days' are to be considered with data from the IASC PSEA Mapping exercise if data coverage is ensured. Other data points reflecting the accountability component need to be considered.	

Annex 1. List of Inclusion Criteria

CRITERIA	DEFINITION
Relevance	<p>Meets: Inclusion would be justified based on existing literature and expert opinion</p> <p>Partial: There are some questions over the relevance and other, more relevant, data sources should be considered if available</p> <p>Fails: The data are not considered relevant to the model</p>
Coverage	<p>Meets: data are available for all countries covered under the model or minimal gaps could be easily addressed through alternate data sources or imputation</p> <p>Partial: data are available for most countries and gaps can be filled through manual data collection or imputation</p> <p>Fails: gaps in coverage are significant and addressing them would require extensive time and effort or could not be done with any accuracy</p>
Frequency	<p>Meets: data are updated on a regular basis and ideally annually. Less frequent updates could be acceptable for datasets where the rate of change is inherently slow or where a temporary interruption in data collection and publication resulted from the Covid-19 pandemic</p> <p>Partial: data are updated less often once a year but the frequency of update may be acceptable depending on the subject matter, or update frequency varies between countries and is considered acceptable overall</p> <p>Fails: data are collected infrequently on issues where the rate of change are rapid, or recent data are not expected to be collected in future with sufficient frequency</p>
Quality	<p>Meets: data are considered accurate and authoritative and represent the best available dataset on the subject. Collection and processing methodology are available and meet appropriate standards</p> <p>Partial: data are not necessarily considered accurate but are the best available on the subject matter. There may be some concerns over methodology</p> <p>Fails: data are not considered accurate, or the methodology is unavailable or does not meet acceptable standards</p>
Consistency	<p>Meets: data are collected and analyzed in a consistent way and are comparable across countries and over time</p> <p>Partial: some discrepancies in consistency between countries or over time exist, but these are not thought to significantly undermine the value of the data</p> <p>Fails: data are collected according to multiple different methodologies across countries and are not comparable geographically or over time</p>
Collection⁸	<p>Meets: data on all or most countries are available from a single source and in a format which allows them to be imported with minimal processing. There is little or no requirement to manually fill data gaps</p> <p>Partial: most of the data are available from a single source. Some formatting or processing may be needed. Some data gaps may need to be filled through imputation or manual data collection</p> <p>Fails: data are not available from an existing source and will need to be gathered manually, or available data will require a high degree of processing</p>

⁸ This criterion has been added in final stages of Indicators review to facilitate the selection of indicators.

Annex 2. Statistical Validation

A statistical validation was performed on the draft index using the COIN Tool published by the European Union's Competence Centre on Composite Indicators and Scoreboards (CC-COIN). The validation included the 16 components, 8 categories and 4 dimensions of the SEARO index as well as the overall risk score.

Setup: The validation tool was setup with three levels of aggregation: components (defined by the COIN Tool as 'indicators'), categories ('sub-pillars') and dimensions ('pillars'). Equal Weighting was set for all components, categories and dimensions. Direction was set as 1 (high value corresponds to high risk). Aggregation was set as 'arithmetic average'. Several target ranges were then set for statistical factors and elements falling outside of these ranges were flagged for further exploration. The aim of this process was to identify components that were

- Index score between 1.0 and 9.9
- Mean value between 3.0 and 7.0
- Median value between 3.0 and 7.0
- Skewness⁹ between -2.0 to 2.0
- Kurtosis¹⁰ between -3.5 to 3.5
- Standard Deviation between 1.0 to 2.5
- Positive correlations below 0.9
- Negative correlation within the same category

A first pass of the COIN Tool found that 10 of the 16 components fell outside one or more of the preferred statistical ranges. Five components had minimum scores below 1.0, four had Mean or Median scores outside range, three had high Standard Deviations, and one had a Skewness out of range. Each of the affected components were explored further to understand the source of the outlying value and, where the cause wasn't inherent to the dataset itself, the formula was adjusted accordingly. After each adjustment the COIN Tool was re-calculated, as a change to any one component will affect correlations with all other components of the model. After several rounds of adjustment, the final index saw the following overall ranges:

- Index scores range from 1.0 to 9.9 (within preferred range)
- Mean values range from 5.2 to 7.0 (within preferred range)
- Median values range from 4.8 to 7.4 (slightly above maximum range of 7.0)
- Skewness values range from -0.6 to 1.2 (within preferred range)
- Kurtosis values range from -1.3 to 0.7 (within preferred range)
- Standard Deviations range from 0.8 to 2.5 (slightly above minimum range of 1.0)
- Positive correlations between components and categories, dimensions and overall risk range from 0.03 to 0.74 (within preferred range)

⁹ Skewness measures asymmetry in the distribution of an indicator with zero skew occurring where the mean and median values are the same. A right / positive skew sees a longer 'tail' of values to the right of the distribution as the mean (arithmetic average) value is larger than the median (middle) value, with a left / negative skew seeing a longer 'tail' to the left as the mean value is lower than the median. The Skewness threshold was maintained at COIN's default value of 2.0

¹⁰ Kurtosis is a way to measure the occurrence of outliers through the 'tailedness' of a distribution curve. COIN measures the deviation from normal distribution. The Kurtosis threshold was maintained at COIN's default value of 3.5

The two components (Operational Size & Operational Complexity) in the Needs Scale and Complexity category are highly colinear (0.92 and 0.94 respectively) and fall outside of the preferred range of 0.9. Other positive correlations are the Operational Design component of the Response Modalities category (0.93) and the Leaderships & Staffing component of Response Institutions (0.92). There is a single pairing of components showing a small negative correlation: Coordination & Leadership and Funding & Resources (-0.08). Overall, the Protective Environment dimension shows the weakest correlation to the model overall, though this is to be expected given that this dimension reflects factors that aim to reduce risk and that should be targeted in the highest-risk operations.