**Sample Risk Assessment from Lebanon**

**Annex 1 – Sample Risk Assessment Tool for Interventions**

Note: The below is not intended as an exhausted list of potential questions or considerations. Also, SEA risks should be considered at all stages of the programme cycle or a particular intervention.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Focus | Key points to consider for risk mitigation | Possible Risk Mitigation Measures |
| Profile of groups receiving assistance  | * Who will directly or indirectly be benefiting from this programme/ intervention (e.g. what is the age (groups), gender, background, status, disabilities, etc.)?
* What are some of the main characteristics that may render them more susceptible to SEA? Some individuals may have overlapping (inter-sectional) vulnerabilities (e.g. mothers with disabilities, ethnic minority women, girls subjected to child marriage, etc.).
 | * Adapt awareness-raising efforts on SEA, including where and how to report misconduct, to meet specific the needs of affected populations (e.g. language, approaches).
* Consider targeted messaging for those groups that are highly susceptible to SEA. Consult with target groups to ensure communication approaches are relevant and meets their respective needs.
 |
| Profile of personnel involved in the delivery of assistance / services | * Which staff/volunteers/contractors are delivering goods and services? Is there an adequate gender balance, particularly for staff directly engaging with affected women and children?
* Have staff been sufficiently vetted as part of the selection/recruitment process, explained and signed the organizational Code of Conduct and trained on PSEA, including volunteers?
 | * Re-adjust gender balance of program staff to include more female staff, if required.
* Conduct trainings or refresher trainings on SEA, specifically focused on possible risks associated with the particular programme/service delivery.
* Review HR files of staff/personnel and conduct additional screening for previous misconduct, where needed.
 |
| Programme activities / interventions | * What is the size and scale of the program? Will the programme or intervention create or exacerbate existing imbalances between program staff and members of the community?
* Does the program involve direct interaction between staff and children, or other particularly vulnerable groups? (for example in kind distributions).
* How are staff delivering goods and services (e.g. in private or in public)? Will it involve accessing the homes of vulnerable persons?
* Would there be witnesses in case of an SEA incident? Are staff working in pairs (ideally gender-mixed)?
* Does the process for delivering goods and services enable staff and affected people to raise concerns or make complaints in a safe, confidential environment?
* Do staff wear uniforms, organizational t-shirts and/or other forms of identification when conducting program activities?
* Will the modality for delivery require vulnerable persons (e.g. women and girls) to travel on their own to access the distribution point, potentially requiring the use of taxis or other means of accessing and exposing them to abuse and harassment in the process?
 | * Analyse contextual issues (see below) to ensure interventions do not inadvertently exacerbate existing tensions or vulnerabilities, in line with do no harm and conflict sensitivity approaches.
* Arrange periodic site visits by PSEA focal point, protection staff or other independent observer to monitor for possible SEA risks or incidents.
* Change location(s) of distribution to make it more public. Where relevant/possible, include local women leaders or community representatives as part of the process. In some cases, specific distribution times and points specifically for women may be considered.
* Identify alternative/additional channels for making complaints safely and confidentially.
* Request staff to wear forms of identification when conducting program activities (and provide such forms of identification where needed).
* Consider providing transportation support to women/girls to access assistance. Or changing the location / modality for delivery of assistance, as required.
 |
| Context | * What is the type of location for project (camp, informal settlement, host community, rural/urban setting, etc.)?
* What are specific risks associated with the location for the program (e.g. lack of availability of mechanisms for prevention and redress, insecurity, traditional justice structures, etc)?
* What is the affected community’s attitude towards GBV concerns? How comfortable would they be reporting SEA concerns?
 | * Create a more secure environment at program location (e.g. install lights, hire night guards)
* Work with communities to adapt feedback and complaints mechanisms to meet their needs. In the current COVID context, consider how remote/online feedback and reporting can be strengthened or introduced in the absence of in-person reporting.
 |