IASC
Inter-Agency Standing Committee

SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE RISK OVERVIEW

SEARO

CONCEPT
AND METHODOLOGY

2025 SEARO GLOBAL INDEX
VERSION 1.0, NOVEMBER 2024

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

USE and ATTRIBUTION

The SEARO Global Index is a public good developed by UNICEF and OCHA and is freely available for use. However, any adaptation, modification, or incorporation of the SEARO tool and its framework into other tools, systems or methodologies for public or interagency use must receive prior written permission from UNICEF and OCHA. For private or internal use within an organization, no permission is required.

Suggested Citation: UNICEF, OCHA, & IASC Secretariat. 2025 Sexual Exploitation and Abuse Risk Overview (SEARO) Global Index. Published November 2024.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Wendy Cue at the IASC Secretariat (cue@un.org),
Ivana Chapcakova at UNICEF (ichapcakova@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 Analysis Framework was developed in 2022 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 Analysis Framework. The first SEARO Index was published in Beta in September 2022, covering 34 countries with a Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan (HNRP), Flash Appeal (FA) or similar funding and response mechanism.

In 2024, SEARO went through a thorough review that was informed by insights gained from testing the Beta version of the Index, extensive discussions with global experts and humanitarian practitioners, as well as a review of relevant literature. The revised SEARO Global Index includes new and updated indicators and data sources while enhancing features to boost its functionality.

SEARO comprises four Dimensions and reflects risk factors that: exist in every country (Enabling Environment); are introduced along with one or more crises (Situational Context); are introduced along with a humanitarian response operation (Operational Context); and potentially mitigated through specific measures that aim to address SEA (Protective Environment). These dimensions are built on data from credible sources such as UN agencies, governments and multilateral organizations.

This document describes the revised concept and methodology behind the SEARO Global Index. It contains a description of the conceptual framework, 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 ABREVIATIONS

BHA	USAID Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance
CEB	United Nations System Chief Executives Board
CC-COIN	European Union's Competence Centre on Composite Indicators and Scoreboards
CP	Child Protection
ERP	Emergency Response Plan
FA	Flash Appeal
FCDO	UK Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office
FTS	Financial Tracking Service
GBV	Gender-based Violence
GII	Gender Inequality Index
GIWPS	Georgetown Institute for Women's Peace and Security
HC	Humanitarian Coordinator
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HDI	Human Development Index
HNO	Humanitarian Needs Overview
HPC	Humanitarian Program Cycle
HNRP	Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
INFORM	Index for Risk Management
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OSC-SEA	UN Office of the Special Coordinator on improving the UN response to SEA
PSEA	Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
PSEACap	PSEA Capacity Project
RP	Response Plan
SEA	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
SEARO	SEA Risk Overview
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United nations
UNDPO	United Nations Department of Peace Operations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	US Agency for International Development
VAWC	Violence Against Women and Children
WB	World Bank
WGI	Worldwide Governance Indicators
WHO	World Health Organization
WJP	World Justice Project

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 and 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 US Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (USAID BHA), the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office (UK-FCDO), the PSEA Capacity Project (PSEACap), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), working under the umbrella of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), developed an evidence-based tool to understand and measure factors that influence the risk of SEA in humanitarian operations. An Advisory Group including other donors, UN agencies and INGOs provided subject-matter and technical guidance.

The project was initiated in January 2022. The SEARO Analysis Framework was published in September 2022 along with a Beta version of a SEARO composite index. The project resumed in January 2024 to collect user feedback and revise the composite index methodology. The production version, the 2025 SEARO Global Index, was published in November 2024.

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 Situational Context - risks that are added when a country is impacted by one or more crises; 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 Needs and Response Plan (HNRP), Emergency Response Plan (ERP), or Flash Appeal (FA) in the current or previous calendar year. It provides a score from 1.0 to 9.9 for each of the model's 4 dimensions, 8 categories and 16 components. The index will be updated annually, as well when new response plans are launched.

SEARO contributes to [Commitment 3 of the IASC vision and strategy.](#) SEARO aims to provide a common, shared, and informed basis for identifying SEA risks, and for comparing those risks 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. SEARO helps in designing effective mitigation measures by identifying risks and capacity gaps to be addressed. The index enhances evidence-based programming while supporting planning and monitoring of indicators over time. Finally, SEARO strengthens a culture of prevention and accountability, providing the PSEA community with a standardized tool for analysis that can be crucial in shared risk mitigation efforts.

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 - staff of international and national organisations, government staff, members of civil society groups, community leaders, volunteers and other actors involved in humanitarian operations - have a responsibility to protect civilians, but they may also become perpetrators of this type of violence.

The definition of SEA includes two components:

- "Sexual exploitation" means any actual or attempted abuse of a position of vulnerability, differential power, or trust, for sexual purposes, including, but not limited to, profiting monetarily, socially or politically from the sexual exploitation of another.

- "Sexual abuse" means the actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, whether by force or under unequal or coercive conditions.

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 restricted by the limited data available; Prevalence 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, situational, operational, 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 and revision of SEARO has been guided by the following design principles:

Framework-first: The Analysis 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 Analysis Framework also reflects underlying gender and power dynamics that can influence the risk of this particular type of gender-based violence. Overall, the Analysis Framework is presented as a stand-alone product that is being used not only as the conceptual basis of the SEARO composite index, but as the framework for other forms of analysis of SEA[1].

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 was designed with the best data available at the time of the index's release. The index was revised in 2024 including the replacement of the original indicators to strengthen the model. The index will be revised bi-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.

---

1. Since its launch in October 2022, several organizations, agencies and networks have used the SEARO Analysis Framework to develop other SEA risk measures and assessment tools such as the IARA SEA Toolkit by the IOM. Country teams have also used SEARO to frame their SEA risk assessments locally.

2.1 DESIGN PROCESS

In 2022, An initial 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 risk. Each of these potential indicators were reviewed against six quality criteria (Annex I) to evaluate their usability in the model, with an aim to identify at least one viable indicator for each of the 16 'components'. That review process initially identified 34 indicators which met the minimum criteria and which were evaluated in more detail to assess their suitability for the index, including downloading and examining the dataset and doing a more in-depth review of the other criteria, a process that further reduced the number of indicators to 26. Once the conceptual framework of the index was built and the data selection finalized[2], 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 adjusted through a statistical validation. The model was published as a Beta version in September 2022 to allow for a one-year feedback and review process.

The project resumed in January 2024 with a round of consultations with users of the Beta model. The consultations identified three main areas for improvement: expanding the geographic coverage of the index, increasing the frequency of updates and making the index easier to use and interpret. A review of all the indicators was also conducted and alternative indicators identified and reviewed against the project's quality criteria, with an aim to improve the quality of the model overall as well as addressing the key outcomes of the consultation process. A revised model was finalized in October 2024 comprising 30 indicators from 12 sources and 10 organizations. After further statistical validation the 2025 SEARO Global Index was published as a production version in November 2024.

Main updates to the 2025 SEARO Global Index			
Updated nomenclature of the Analysis framework	**Adjusted indicators**	**Expanded coverage**	**Increased Responsiveness**
The names of some components of the Framework were revised to simplify and add clarity to the terms	Some indicators were replaced and new indicators and data sources were added to strengthen the validity of the model	The inclusion of new indicators expanded coverage of the index to more than 80 countries through an Extended dataset[3] that will allow the rapid inclusion of countries into the Index should a new crisis arise	Since new indicators better meet the frequency and accessibility criteria, the model can be updated rapidly and with fewer resources. The development of the Extended dataset has also improved the responsiveness of the Index

2.2 STATISTICAL VALIDATION

A statistical validation was performed on the SEARO index based on 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 robustness[4]. 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.

To maintain equal weighting across all components of the index a number of parameters were set and component formulas adjusted to ensure that each component, category and dimension fell within these ranges. To avoid overweighting the model overall - as member countries all have major ongoing humanitarian crises - the validation was done on a larger array of countries that are part of the INFORM Severity Index. This provided for the statistical validation to include countries representing crises of different scales, as well as countries with no ongoing crisis but that are considered disaster-prone. Within this broader dataset, the following ranges were applied to each component, category and dimension to ensure balance across the index:

---

2. 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.

3. The SEARO Extended dataset is available on demand.

4. A user guide for the COIN Tool is available here.

Minimum (1.0) and Maximum (9.9)

Mean (4.0 to 6.0) and Median (4.0 to 6.0)

Skewness[5] (-2.0 to 2.0)

Kurtosis[6] (-3.5 to 3.5)

Standard Deviation[7] (0.8 to 2.5)

Positive correlations between components in the first three dimensions were kept below a target of 0.9, except for the 'People Affected' and 'Vulnerability' components which were highly colinear (0.94). Negative correlation is expected between components in the Protective Environment dimension and the other dimensions, since protective PSEA measures are being directed towards countries with higher risk. Negative correlation was also seen between the 'Staffing' and 'Organizational Culture' components in the Operational Context dimension, suggesting that offices in larger operations (measured by staff numbers) have made greater efforts and inroads to promoting and enforcing PSEA than offices in smaller operations.

2.3   METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

The development of SEARO encountered two main constraints related to data limitations and methodological challenges.

Data availability. The index relies on country-level secondary data that meets acceptable standards for relevance, coverage, frequency, consistency, quality and accessibility. 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.

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 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 source available, 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 analysis model that 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.

---

5.   Skewness measures the asymmetry of data, with positive skew indicating a longer tail on the right, negative skew a longer tail on the left, and zero skew indicating symmetry

6.   Kurtosis measures the "tailedness" of data, with high kurtosis indicating more extreme values in the tails, low kurtosis indicating fewer extremes, and normal kurtosis resembling a bell curve

7.   Standard deviation measures how spread out the data is, with a higher value indicating more variability and a lower value indicating that the data points are closer to the average

3 ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

The SEARO Analysis 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 Analysis 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 one or more crises; 3) are introduced along with a humanitarian response operation; and 4) are mitigated through 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.

Dimension	Enabling Environment				Situational Context				Operational Context				Protective Environment			
Category	Laws & Practices		Human Rights & Inequalities		People at Risk		Needs & Complexity		Response Institutions		Response Modalities		Capacity & Resources		Mechanisms & Accountability	
Component	Laws & Practices	Institutional Strength	Violence Against Women & Children	Gender Inequalities	People Affected	Vulnerability	Scale of Needs	Situational Complexity	Staffing	Organizational Culture	Operational Design	Resource Gaps	PSEA Coordination	PSEA Resources	Reporting & Accountability	Survivor Assitance

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.

Laws, Policies & Practices

Laws & Practices

Weak legal frameworks with restricted policies that protect the security of women, children and other vulnerable groups can leave victims of SEA unprotected and perpetrators unpunished. This creates a climate of impunity that disincentivizes reporting and emboldens perpetrators. Several societal norms and practices can normalize exploitation and abuse, discourage victims from reporting, and protect perpetrators. For instance, harmful practices like child marriage or female genital mutilation (FGM) normalize the control of girls' bodies and limit their agency. This creates an environment where sexual abuse is seen as acceptable, particularly against young girls. Societies tend to be permissive with GBV and other types of violence against vulnerable groups such as disabled people, LGBTI, people living with HIV, people from certain ethnic groups and other marginalized groups. Traditional practices like forced marriage to perpetrator or social punishment within families or communities prioritize family honor over holding perpetrators accountable, allowing the abuse to continue. Social stigma surrounding sexual activity, particularly outside of marriage, can discourage victims, especially women, from reporting abuse due to fear of shame or rejection by their communities. Moreover, societies that blame victims for attracting abuse, focusing on their behavior instead of the perpetrator's actions, create a chilling effect on reporting. Victims may hesitate to come forward fearing social ostracization or accusations of promiscuity.

Institutional Strength

Deeply interlinked with the first component, government effectiveness and the rule of law play a crucial role in influencing the occurrence of SEA. A well-functioning legal system with strong law enforcement capacity increases the likelihood of prosecution and punishment of perpetrators, bringing justice to victims. Furthermore, abusers are discouraged to break the laws and commit crimes. Additionally, a robust legal system with clear procedures for reporting any type of GBV, including SEA, as well as access to legal aid empowers victims to seek justice. This can help break the cycle of impunity and encourage others to come forward. Increasing the government's capacity to prevent, investigate, and prosecute SEA cases can strengthen law enforcement. This includes strengthening of institutions and capacities of personnel, particularly those assistance providers (police, medical staff, social services, judiciary and first respondents).

Human Rights & Inequalities

Violence Against Women & Children

The prevalence of violence against women and children (VAWC) and other vulnerable groups significantly increases the likelihood of SEA. The existence of other types of GBV increases the tolerance societies have towards SEA and the normalization of all types of abuse against women, children and other vulnerable groups. On the other hand, if women and children have a history of experiencing violence from authorities or figures of power, they may be less likely to report SEA perpetrated by the same individuals, those associated with them or anyone in a position of power (including aid workers). This distrust can create a climate of silence and impunity that further enables the occurrence of SEA. Women and children facing violence at home or within their communities may have limited options to escape or seek help. This lack of resources can force them into situations where they have to submit to SEA to survive or will become more vulnerable to any type of abuse since they lack the minimum protective system in the house and/or community. Finally, the fear of retaliation or social stigma associated with reporting any form of GBV can extend to SEA. As explained under the first component above, the same social norms that perpetuate GBV do influence SEA and the reporting capacity of victims.

Gender Inequality

Gender inequalities play a significant role in creating an environment where SEA can flourish. Deep-rooted gender norms that emphasize male dominance and female submissiveness exacerbate power imbalances and make girls and women more vulnerable to exploitation. When women lack control over resources or decision-making power within households, they are more likely to be forced into situations where they have to exchange sex for basic necessities, especially during times of crisis[8]. Moreover, the expectation of women to be passive and avoid confrontation can deter them from speaking up about abuse. Within the specific context of humanitarian assistance, gender bias within aid distribution processes can unintentionally exclude women and girls from accessing essential services and resources. This can make them more vulnerable to exploitation in their desperation to meet basic needs.

---

8.   International Rescue Committee (IRC). (n.d.). Sexual Violence and Exploitation in Humanitarian Emergencies. https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/4263/ircgbvpoli-cyreportint2.pdf

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.

People at Risk

People Affected

The number of people affected and any situation with a strong aid dependency can significantly contribute to the risk of SEA. The crisis may increase the vulnerabilities of the population and affect them in different ways. Large-scale crises often lead to displacement and disruption to social structures and family networks. Conflict and instability can lead to a breakdown of law and order, increase protection needs and diminish safety and security of populations. Moreover, crises can overwhelm existing resources, leading to shortages of food, water, shelter, and healthcare, making populations more vulnerable and in need of external assistance.

Vulnerability

The vulnerability of the people affected can be subjective and depends on the pre-existing conditions in the country (see Dimension on Enabling Environment). The lives of affected people are not disrupted in the same way and thus, this component looks at the conditions and vulnerabilities of individuals, particularly those who are already marginalized or disadvantaged, are the most affected by shortages of food, water, shelter, and healthcare, creating a desperate situation that could enable their abuse and exploitation. Crises often destroy livelihoods and infrastructure, leading to unemployment and economic hardship. A lack of income can make individuals, especially women who may face cultural barriers to earning a living, more vulnerable to exploitation. Furthermore, the severity of a crisis can exacerbate existing power imbalances between aid workers and beneficiaries. Humanitarian organizations may be the only source of life-saving assistance, creating a situation where beneficiaries feel powerless to refuse unwanted sexual advances for fear of losing access to critical aid.

Needs & Complexity

Scale of Needs

The larger the humanitarian needs, the higher the risk of SEA since larger operations bring an increased number of staff, volunteers and possibly security forces. Larger volumes of aid are provided which creates more opportunities of interactions between aid workers and the local populations. Larger operations usually have access to higher volumes of resources, allowing for distribution of aid to larger numbers of people. However, managing large and complex operations can also lead to more logistical problems such as complex assistance structures (with several levels of implementing structures), excessive reliance on non-trained volunteers or community members or access to locations with difficult oversight. All these situations affect how aid providers adhere to the expected codes of conduct and potentially make monitoring of activities more difficult.

Situational Complexity

Large humanitarian operations usually involve complex and challenging coordination and management efforts. Mobilizing large volumes of personnel, resources, assistance items, construction materials, transportation means and others demand complex operations, usually led and managed remotely with little time to put in place safeguarding mechanisms. Physical access and security is determinant to the provision of aid. Contextual factors that inhibit or complicate the access to affected populations may put the operations at risk and the safeguarding and mitigation efforts may be overlooked. Examples of constraints include geography, climate and weather, road networks, communication networks, insecurity, landmines or UXO, and social instability.

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 be to perform or accept any act of SEA. Other underlying assumptions for this dimension are related to the type of assistance aid institutions provide. As highlighted by some studies 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.

Response Institutions

Staffing

The number and distribution of staff in countries is a significant factor, particularly in operations where large amounts of new personnel need to be recruited in a short period of time. Additionally, the gender distribution of the staff matters, particularly among those positions in direct contact with the beneficiaries and frontline staff such as those working at the food distribution points, volunteers, guards, drivers, storage keepers and other professions traditionally occupied by men. Studies show that the presence of more women in operations and leadership roles can mitigate risks.[9] When staff are well-equipped to identify, prevent, and report SEA, the risk of occurrence is also reduced and it fosters a culture of safety.

Organizational Culture

By creating an organizational culture that prioritizes safety, empowers staff, and fosters open communication, aid organizations can significantly reduce the risk of SEA and create a more trustworthy and accountable presence in the communities they serve. This includes having clear policies against sexual harassment and abuse, alongside robust reporting mechanisms. Good corporate practices involve empowering staff to intervene if they witness or suspect SEA. This includes providing training on how to identify and report abuse, as well as clear guidelines on appropriate behavior with beneficiaries. It also includes implementing thorough background checks and vetting procedures for all staff which can further mitigate the risk of recruiting potential perpetrators.

Response Modalities

Operational Design

Aid-delivery programs don't inherently cause SEA but certain program characteristics and implementation approaches can create a higher risk environment. Cash-based interventions, food distribution and shelter provision have been identified by some experts as vulnerable to the occurrence of all forms of misconduct, including SEA.[10] Particularly in contexts of weak governance and social safety nets, distribution of food and cash under the control of particular individuals with power to decide who receives support, can create opportunities for abuse and exploitation. Likewise, overcrowded or poorly managed shelters, especially those lacking separate facilities for men, women, and children, can increase the risk of sexual assault and harassment.[11]

---

9. Potts A, Fattal L, Hedge E, Hallak F, and Reese A. (2020). Empowered Aid: Participatory Action Research with Refugee Women & Girls to Better Prevent Sexual Exploitation and Abuse- Lebanon Results Report. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

10. See citation above.

11. See Minimum Standards for Sheltering People in Emergencies." 1: https://sheltercluster.s3.eu-central-1.amazonaws.com/public/docs/8.minimum-standards-in-shelter_settle-ment-and-non-food-items.pdf

Response Gaps

Gaps in funding and implementation of life-saving humanitarian activities can have an impact on the mitigation of risks of SEA. When basic needs like food, shelter, and healthcare are not adequately met, beneficiaries become more vulnerable to exploitation. Desperate situations can lead them to exchange sex for basic necessities. Likewise, inadequate funding can limit programs that strengthen community networks, empower local organizations to address GBV in general and SEA in particular, and impact the availability of crucial services like psychosocial support, legal aid, and safe spaces for survivors. This lack of support discourages victims from reporting abuse and hinders their ability to find support. Finally, limited resources can lead to weakened monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. This makes it harder to identify and address potential risks of abuse within aid programs.

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 protective environment represents 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.

Capacity & Resources

PSEA Coordination

Strong coordination and leadership among those who prevent and respond to incidents of SEA can mitigate risk. Good coordination fosters open communication among aid organizations, local authorities, and beneficiaries. This allows for consistent messaging about acceptable behavior and establishes clear reporting mechanisms for potential or actual SEA incidents. A strong inter-agency system supports the coordination of efforts through a budgeted Action Plan that prioritizes actions to accelerate PSEA in the countries. Within humanitarian contexts, the role of the inter-agency PSEA Coordinator is key to the implementation of PSEA actions. The stability of the position as well as the seniority and leadership capacities of the coordinator are essential to ensure gaps and risks are addressed in a comprehensive and coordinated manner. Additionally, strong leadership from high-ranking officials[12] creates a working environment where everyone feels empowered to speak up about misconduct without fear of retaliation. Their role ensures a culture of accountability where all humanitarian personnel understand and adhere to a well-defined code of conduct that prohibits SEA and encourages staff to take an active role in preventing and reporting this type of misconduct. Moreover, in-country leadership provide support to PSEA programming and ensure resources and capacities are in place for victims to be empowered so they can report SEA incidents and are promptly referred and assisted.

PSEA Resources

Sufficient funding and resources allocated to Protection from PSEA activities can significantly mitigate the risk of sexual exploitation and abuse in countries with humanitarian operations. Adequate funding allows for a multi-pronged strategy on PSEA. Resources can be directed towards training key staff and implementing partners, developing awareness campaigns for communities and engaging them in consultations, building and strengthening safe and accessible reporting channels or improving referral mechanisms for victims.

---

12.   UN most senior officials in countries such as Resident coordinator (RC), Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG), heads of political missions or peacekeeping operations.

Mechanisms & Accountability

Reporting & Accountability

Strong reporting and investigation structures and systems are a cornerstone in mitigating the risk of SEA, to come forward. Accessible and safe reporting channels empower survivors to come forward and hold perpetrators accountable. These channels should be appropriate for SEA reporting and should be consulted with the communities and adapted to the needs of women, girls and other vulnerable groups.[13] Additionally, effective information sharing on SEA cases[14] contribute to better data on the prevalence and nature of SEA. This data is crucial for understanding the scope of the problem, identifying high-risk areas, and informing targeted prevention strategies. Finally, victim-centered investigations not only empower victims but also discourage future abuse. A well-functioning reporting and accountability system demonstrates that abuses will be taken seriously and perpetrators will be held accountable.

Survivor Assistance

Victim-centred[15] survivor assistance empowers victims and reduces the fear of stigma or lack of help common in countries with humanitarian operations. Effective survivor support systems can break the cycle of silence surrounding SEA. By providing safe and empowering spaces and accessible and confidential reporting channels, survivors feel more comfortable speaking out and can avoid re-victimization and trauma. Strong survivor assistance structures support victims through the legal process, which can include legal aid, ensuring proper evidence collection, and advocating for their rights within the justice system. Furthermore, knowing there are systems in place to address their needs encourages other victims to speak up, leading to investigations and potentially preventing future abuse.

---

13.   See quality criteria described under IASC PSEA Core Indicator 2.1.C. on the IASC PSEA Core Indicators Guidance Note, https://psea.interagencystandingcommittee.org/iasc-psea-mapping-exercise

14.   Not personally identified information and always respecting the principles of confidentiality of alleged perpetrator and victim/s.

15.   IASC Definition & Principles of a Victim/Survivor Centered Approach. https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/iasc-champion-protection-sexual-exploitation-and-abuse-and-sexual-harassment/iasc-definition-principles-victimsurvivor-centered-approach-0

4 INDICATORS

DIMENSION	ENABLING ENVIRONMENT
CATEGORY	**Laws & Practices**
COMPONENT	**Laws & Practices**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses three indicators from one source to represent laws, by assessing the existence of legislation and criminal penalties related to domestic violence and sexual harassment in employment. Two other indicators from two sources are used to represent social practices by measuring underage marriage and women's perceptions of community safety
PROCESSING	The five indicators are grouped into subcomponents representing laws (three indicators) and practices (two indicators). The indicators are equally weighted within each sub-component. The two subcomponents are equally weighted to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	**1. Legislation addressing domestic violence**
SOURCE	World Bank Gender Data Portal
URL	https://genderdata.worldbank.org/en/indicator/sg-leg-dvaw
DESCRIPTION	World Bank data from 2021. DHS/MICS surveys are not conducted yearly; current data ranges from 2010 to 2020
PROCESSING	No significant concerns
INDICATOR	**2. Legislation addressing sexual harassment in employment**
SOURCE	World Bank Gender Data Portal
URL	https://genderdata.worldbank.org/en/indicator/sg-leg-sxhr-em
DESCRIPTION	There is legislation on sexual harassment in employment (1=yes; 0=no)
PROCESSING	Inverted value (1 = no legislation). This indicator represents 16% of the overall component score
INDICATOR	**3. Criminal penalties for sexual harassment in employment**
SOURCE	World Bank Gender Data Portal
URL	https://genderdata.worldbank.org/en/indicator/sg-pen-sxhr-em
DESCRIPTION	Criminal penalties or civil remedies exist for sexual harassment in employment (1=yes; 0=no)
PROCESSING	Inverted value (1 = no legislation). This indicator represents 16% of the overall component score
INDICATOR	**4. Women who were first married by age 15 or 18**
SOURCE	World Bank Gender Data Portal
URL	https://genderdata.worldbank.org/en/indicator/sp-2024-fe-zs
DESCRIPTION	Women who were first married by age 15 or 18 (% of women ages 20-24)
PROCESSING	2 + (SQRT of % value) with a ceiling of 9.9. This indicator accounts for 25% of the overall component score
INDICATOR	**5. Community Safety**
SOURCE	Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace & Security (GIWPS); Women Peace & Security Index
URL	https://giwps.georgetown.edu/the-index/
DESCRIPTION	Percentage of women and girls ages 15 and older who responded "Yes" to the Gallup World Poll question "Do you feel safe walking alone at night in the city or area where you live?"
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalization with MAX (0.7). This indicator accounts for 25% of the overall component score

DIMENSION	ENABLING ENVIRONMENT
CATEGORY	**Laws & Practices**
COMPONENT	**Institutional Strength**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses two indicators from two sources to represent institutional strength. Both indicators are themselves composite indices that include multiple sets of underlying data
PROCESSING	The two indicators are equally weighted to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	**1. Access to Justice**
SOURCE	Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace & Security (GIWPS); Women Peace & Security Index
URL	https://giwps.georgetown.edu/the-index/
DESCRIPTION	Extent (on a scale of 0 to 4) to which women are able to exercise justice by bringing cases before the courts without risk to their personal safety, participating in a free trial, and seeking redress if public authorities violate their rights
PROCESSING	Inverted value. Transformed from 0-4 scale to 0-10 scale through multiplication. MIN-MAX normalization with MIN (0.6) and MAX (1.0)
INDICATOR	**2. Rule of Law**
SOURCE	World Justice Project; Rule of Law Index
URL	https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/factors/2023/Constraints%20on%20Government%20Powers/
DESCRIPTION	Composite index tracking indicators on constraints on government power, absence of corruption, open government, fundamental rights, order and security, regulatory enforcement, civil justice, criminal justice & informal justice
PROCESSING	Inverted value. MIN-MAX normalization using PERCENTRANK with MIN (2.0) and MAX (7.0)

DIMENSION	ENABLING ENVIRONMENT
CATEGORY	**Human Rights & Inequalities**
COMPONENT	**Violence Against Women & Children**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses two indicators from one source. Both indicators are themselves composite indices that include multiple sets of underlying data
PROCESSING	The two indicators are equally weighted to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	**1. Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in the previous 12 months**
SOURCE	Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace & Security (GIWPS); Women Peace & Security Index
URL	https://giwps.georgetown.edu/the-index/
DESCRIPTION	Percentage of ever-partnered women who experienced physical or sexual violence committed by their intimate partner in the 12 months preceding the survey in which the information was gathered
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalization using MAX (0.25)
INDICATOR	**2. Proximity of women to conflict**
SOURCE	Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace & Security (GIWPS); Women Peace & Security Index
URL	https://giwps.georgetown.edu/the-index/
DESCRIPTION	Percentage of women who lived within 50 kilometers of at least one armed conflict event during the period specified
PROCESSING	Transformed through SQRT. MIN-MAX normalization using MAX (1.0)

DIMENSION	ENABLING ENVIRONMENT
CATEGORY	**Human Rights & Inequalities**
COMPONENT	**Gender Inequality**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses a single indicator from a single source. The indicator is itself a composite index
PROCESSING	None
INDICATOR	**1. Gender Inequality Index (GII)**
SOURCE	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Gender Inequality Index (GII)
URL	https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/thematic-composite-indices/gender-inequality-index#/indicies/GII
DESCRIPTION	GII is a composite metric of gender inequality using three dimensions: reproductive health, empowerment and the labour market
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalization using MAX (0.1)

DIMENSION	SITUATIONAL CONTEXT
CATEGORY	**People at Risk**
COMPONENT	**People Affected**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses one indicator from one source. The indicator is itself a composite index
PROCESSING	None
INDICATOR	**1. People Affected by crises**
SOURCE	INFORM Severity; 'INFORM Severity - country' worksheet
URL	https://drmkc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/inform-index/INFORM-Severity
DESCRIPTION	The indicator 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
PROCESSING	Transformed using POWER(2). MIN-MAX normalization using MAX (25)

DIMENSION	SITUATIONAL CONTEXT
CATEGORY	**People at Risk**
COMPONENT	**Vulnerability**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses one indicator from one source. The indicator is itself a composite index
PROCESSING	None
INDICATOR	**1. Conditions of people affected**
SOURCE	INFORM Severity; 'INFORM Severity - country' worksheet
URL	https://drmkc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/inform-index/INFORM-Severity
DESCRIPTION	number of people affected and the conditions of those people, measured through five categories of severity: minimal, stressed, moderate, severe and extreme
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalization using PERCENTRANK with MAX (5)

DIMENSION	SITUATIONAL CONTEXT
CATEGORY	**Needs & Complexity**
COMPONENT	**Scale of Needs**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses two indicators from two sources
PROCESSING	The two subcomponents are equally weighted to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	**1. Aid Dependency**
SOURCE	INFORM Risk; 'Vulnerability' worksheet
URL	https://drmkc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/inform-index/INFORM-Risk
DESCRIPTION	Public Aid per capita and Net Overseas Development Aid as percentage of GNI
PROCESSING	Transformed through LOG(10). MIN-MAX normalization using PERCENTRANK with MAX (1.04)
INDICATOR	**2. Appeal under current Response Plan**
SOURCE	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA); Humanitarian Action
URL	https://humanitarianaction.info/
DESCRIPTION	Funds in US$ requested, and people targeted for assistance, in current Response Plan
PROCESSING	Transformed with SQRT. MIN-MAX normalization of funds requested and people targeted

DIMENSION	SITUATIONAL CONTEXT
CATEGORY	**Needs & Complexity**
COMPONENT	**Situational Complexity**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses one indicator from one source. The indicator is itself a composite index
PROCESSING	None
INDICATOR	**1. Conditions of people affected**
SOURCE	INFORM Severity; 'INFORM Severity - country' worksheet
URL	https://drmkc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/inform-index/INFORM-Severity
DESCRIPTION	number of people affected and the conditions of those people, measured through five categories of severity: minimal, stressed, moderate, severe and extreme
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalization using PERCENTRANK with MAX (5)

DIMENSION	OPERATIONAL CONTEXT
CATEGORY	**Response Institutions**
COMPONENT	**Staffing**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses one indicator from one source on the number and gender ratio of UN staff. Some supplementary data is added from other sources to account for major UN missions not included in the source data (e.g. Peacekeeping contingents and UNRWA)
PROCESSING	None
INDICATOR	**1. Number and gender ratio of UN staff**
SOURCE	UN Chief Executive Board (CEB) with supplementary data from the UN Department of Peace Operations (DPO)
URL	https://unsceb.org/human-resources-statistics and https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/where-we-operate
DESCRIPTION	Number of national and international UN staff by country and the ratio of male to female staff. These numbers are supplemented with additional data on large UN Peacekeeping and similar missions
PROCESSING	Staffing number transformed using SQRT and MIN-MAX normalized using MAX(85). Percentage of female staff MIN-MAX normalized using MIN(0.25) and MAX (0.50). These two sub-indicators are equally weighted to calculate the indicator

DIMENSION	OPERATIONAL CONTEXT
CATEGORY	Response Institutions
COMPONENT	Organizational Culture
DESCRIPTION	The component uses one indicator from one source
PROCESSING	None
INDICATOR	1. Institutional commitment to PSEA
SOURCE	Office of the Special Coordinator on improving UN response to SEA (OSC-SEA); Annual Survey concerning SEA
URL	Detailed survey data are not available through a public URL but may be available upon request
DESCRIPTION	Survey respondents agreeing with the statements "I trust that my organization will ensure that personnel who engage in sexual exploitation and abuse will face disciplinary action" and "Prevention of and response to sexual exploitation and abuse is taken seriously at my duty station"
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalized using MAX (0.20). Highest value of the two sub-indicators used to calculate the score

DIMENSION	OPERATIONAL CONTEXT
CATEGORY	Response Modalities
COMPONENT	Operational Design
DESCRIPTION	The component uses two indicators from two sources. Total humanitarian funding has global geographic coverage whilst the second indicator on funding of food, cash and NFI has limited geographical coverage of countries with humanitarian response plans in the previous or current calendar year
PROCESSING	The maximum score of the two indicators is used to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	1. Total humanitarian funding
SOURCE	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA); Financial Tracking Service (FTS)
URL	https://fts.unocha.org/
DESCRIPTION	Total humanitarian funding (US$) reported to FTS
PROCESSING	Transformed using POWER(0.1). MIN-MAX normalization using PERCENTRANK with MIN(3.0) MAX (Range)
INDICATOR	2. Response plan funding for cash, food and non-food items
SOURCE	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA); Humanitarian Action
URL	https://humanitarianaction.info/
DESCRIPTION	Proportion of response plan funds earmarked for cash, food and non-food items (NFI)
PROCESSING	If data are not available for the current response plan, the prior year's plan is used. Two sub-indicators are calculated. 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

DIMENSION	OPERATIONAL CONTEXT
CATEGORY	Response Modalities
COMPONENT	Resource Gaps
DESCRIPTION	Two indicators are used from two sources
PROCESSING	The two indicators are equally weighted to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	1. Restrictions to access and monitoring
SOURCE	INFORM Severity; Crisis Indicator Data
URL	https://drmkc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/inform-index/INFORM-Severity

DESCRIPTION	The indicator combines three sub-indicators from INFORM Severity to represent obstacles to access and monitoring: impediments to entry into country (bureaucratic and administrative); Restriction of movement (impediments to freedom of movement and/or administrative restrictions); and interference into implementation of humanitarian activities
PROCESSING	1 + SUM of the three sub-indicator scores (which range in value from 1-3)
INDICATOR	**2. Response Plan gaps in funding and people reached**
SOURCE	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA); Humanitarian Action
URL	https://humanitarianaction.info/
DESCRIPTION	The indicator comprises two sub-indicators: the amount of funds requested in the Response Plan that were received, and the number of people targeted that were reached. These represent the gaps in funding and delivery of assistance.
PROCESSING	The sub-indicators are transformed using SQRT then MIN-MAX normalized using MAX values equal to gaps of $1bn in funding and 1m people

DIMENSION	**PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT**
CATEGORY	**Capacity & Resources**
COMPONENT	**PSEA Coordination**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses two indicators from two sources to represent organizational commitment to PSEA through both policies and resourcing, as well as specific PSEA coordination resources in IASC priority countries
PROCESSING	The two indicators are equally weighted to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	**1. Agency leadership and awareness**
SOURCE	Office of the Special Coordinator on improving UN response to SEA (OSC-SEA); Annual Survey concerning SEA
URL	Detailed survey data are not available through a public URL but may be available upon request
DESCRIPTION	Survey respondents agreeing with the statements "my organization has clear policies on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse" and "my organization actively raises awareness among its staff and related personnel regarding the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (other than training)"
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalized using MAX (0.20). Highest value of the two sub-indicators used to calculate the score
INDICATOR	**2. PSEA Network and Coordinator**
SOURCE	IASC PSEA annual mapping exercise, carried out by UNICEF on behalf of the IASC
URL	Detailed data is not available but information on the countries' PSEA Networks and Coordinators can be found in the IASC PSEA Dashboard
DESCRIPTION	The indicator draws on 7 sub-indicators compiled through the IASC's annual PSEA mapping exercise. The sub-indicators represent the presence of a designated inter-agency coordinator, their seniority and contract type, training and reporting lines. The sub-indicator also includes the extent to which a PSEA action plan has been budgeted.
PROCESSING	Sub-indicators are equally weighted and MIN-MAX normalized using the total range values

DIMENSION	**PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT**
CATEGORY	**Capacity & Resources**
COMPONENT	**PSEA Resources**
DESCRIPTION	The component uses three indicators from three sources. The OSC-SEA survey has global geographic coverage whilst the indicators from OCHA and the IASC have coverage limited to countries with Response Plans
PROCESSING	Sub-indicators are equally weighted to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	**1. Agency resourcing of training and PSEA focal points**
SOURCE	Office of the Special Coordinator on improving UN response to SEA (OSC-SEA); Annual Survey concerning SEA
URL	Detailed survey data are not available through a public URL but may be available upon request
DESCRIPTION	Survey respondents agreeing with the statements "over the last 12 months, I received additional training on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse" and "there is an appointed person(s) for prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse at my duty station?"
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalized using MAX (0.55)

INDICATOR	2. Response Plan funding for GBV and Child Protection
SOURCE	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA); Humanitarian Action
URL	https://humanitarianaction.info/
DESCRIPTION	The indicator comprises two sub-indicators on the percentage of funds requested in the Response Plan earmarked for GBV and Child Protection in the current response plan if available, or the previous year's response plan if not.
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalized using PERCENTRANK with MAX(10)
INDICATOR	3. Integration of PSEA into the Response Plan
SOURCE	IASC PSEA annual mapping exercise, carried out by UNICEF on behalf of the IASC
URL	https://psea.interagencystandingcommittee.org/dashboard
DESCRIPTION	Extent to which a PSEA Action Plan has been integrated into the Response Plan on a 1-4 scale
PROCESSING	Values converted individually to a 1.0 to 9.9 scale

DIMENSION	PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT
CATEGORY	Mechanisms & Accountability
COMPONENT	Reporting & Accountability
DESCRIPTION	The component uses two indicators from two sources. The OSC-SEA survey has global geographic coverage whilst the indicators from the IASC have coverage limited to countries with Response Plans
PROCESSING	The two indicators are equally weighted to calculate the component score
INDICATOR	1. Strength of agency reporting mechanisms
SOURCE	Office of the Special Coordinator on improving UN response to SEA (OSC-SEA); Annual Survey concerning SEA
URL	Detailed survey data are not available through a public URL but may be available upon request
DESCRIPTION	Survey respondents agreeing with the statements "my organization provides clear information on how and where to report incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse" and "if I report an instance of sexual exploitation and abuse, I can do so without fear of retaliation"
PROCESSING	MIN-MAX normalized using MAX (0.25)
INDICATOR	2. Scale and roll-out of PSEA SOPs
SOURCE	IASC PSEA annual mapping exercise, carried out by UNICEF on behalf of the IASC
URL	https://psea.interagencystandingcommittee.org/dashboard
DESCRIPTION	Status of the endorsement and roll-out of PSEA SOPs on a 1-4 scale
PROCESSING	Values converted individually to a 1.0 to 9.9 scale

DIMENSION	PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENT
CATEGORY	Mechanisms & Accountability
COMPONENT	Survivor Assistance
DESCRIPTION	The component uses one indicator from one source
PROCESSING	None
INDICATOR	1. Assistance rendered in response to allegations
SOURCE	Office of the Special Coordinator on improving UN response to SEA (OSC-SEA); Annual Survey concerning SEA
URL	Detailed survey data are not available through a public URL but may be available upon request
DESCRIPTION	This indicator captures the actual access to GBV services by SEA victims. Data are collected by UN agencies and their implementing partners through UN reporting channels on allegations. The system records data on "assistance rendered". 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. A high score indicates either a lack of progress on deciding assistance or a lack of reporting on status
PROCESSING	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.

Annex 1

INDICATOR QUALITY CRITERIA

CRITERIA	DEFINITION
RELEVANCE	**MEETS** Inclusion would be justified based on existing literature and expert opinion **PARTIAL** There are some questions over the relevance and other, more relevant, data sources should be considered if available **FAILS** The data are not considered relevant to the model
COVERAGE	**MEETS** Data are available for all countries, or minimal gaps could be easily addressed through alternate data sources or imputation **PARTIAL** Data are available for most countries and gaps can be filled through manual data collection or imputation **FAILS** Gaps in coverage are significant. Addressing them would require extensive effort or could not be done with any accuracy
FREQUENCY	**MEETS** Data are updated on a regular basis and ideally annually. Less frequent updates are acceptable for datasets where the rate of change is slow or where a temporary interruption in data collection and publication resulted from the Covid-19 pandemic **PARTIAL** Data are updated less often than once a year but the frequency is acceptable considering the subject matter, or update frequency varies between countries and is considered acceptable overall **FAILS** Data are collected infrequently on issues where the rate of change is rapid, or recent data are not expected to be collected in future with sufficient frequency
QUALITY	**MEETS** Data are considered accurate and authoritative and represent the best available data on the subject. Collection and processing methodology are available and meet appropriate standards **PARTIAL** Data are not necessarily considered accurate but are the best available, or there are some concerns over methodology **FAILS** Data are not considered accurate, or the methodology is unavailable or does not meet acceptable standards
CONSISTENCY	**MEETS** Data are collected and analyzed in a consistent way and are comparable across countries and over time **PARTIAL** Some discrepancies in consistency exist, but these are not thought to significantly undermine the value of the data **FAILS** Data are collected using different methodologies across countries and are not comparable geographically or over time
COLLECTION	**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 **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 **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