

MOPAN Methodology Revisions - Concept note

11 October 2018

External Stakeholder Feedback & Reviewing sources of country level data

Issue and scope of work

MOPAN seeks to gather both perception data and an understanding of practice of multilateral organisations (MO) undergoing assessment from a diverse set of stakeholders. To date, MOPAN collects inputs from external stakeholders via an online survey at country-level.

The 2018 Methodology Review of MOPAN highlighted the survey stream directed at MO stakeholders as being the weakest line of evidence in the current assessment process. Similarly, the 2013 Independent External Evaluation of MOPAN also noted a number of challenges pertaining to the survey, highlighted below. Some of the weaknesses include difficulty in finding suitable respondents, low response rates, and a mismatch between countries chosen for surveys and the MOs included in a particular assessment cycle.

In March 2018, the Secretariat asked Members to report on what type of country-level data their administrations collect on the performance of MOs at country level. The intention of this exercise was to identify gaps. Of the few that reported back, most signalled that they rely solely on information from the MOs in these areas, and do not collect their own.

Lesson learning

The survey, which has been the cornerstone of MOPAN since its inception, is not without its challenges. The Independent External Evaluation of MOPAN, tabled in September 2013, highlighted a number of these, many of which remain relevant today.

First, the selection of countries in which the survey takes place seeks to ensure that a range of factors assumed to affect a multilaterals performance area sampled, but in reality these are not criteria that are focused on allowing generalisation through statistical representation. The evaluation stated that they are more akin to the criteria that would be used in case-based approaches to generalization, under which generalization takes place through theory.

Beyond this, MOPAN presupposes that those responding are in a strong position to judge the multilateral organisation's overall performance at country level. In parallel, the sample of countries is non-random and the results aggregated before analysis. This approach lacks methodological credibility when examining either the overall impact or contribution of an organisation.

In 2016, reported lessons stated that while the survey of external partners yielded valuable qualitative data, the concept of identifying the right people as respondents did not work well, attributed to lack

of time. In 2018, improvements were not evident, despite an extension of the implementation timeline to identify and collect respondents.

Specific to the survey, some further challenges identified included the following:

- 1) As in 2013, the quality of the data remains an issue. Despite an average response rate of 25% across two assessment cycles, a significant percentage of “don’t know” responses suggest that the level of familiarity of some respondents with the organisation being assessment may not be sufficient to respond to all questions. This undermines validity. The occurrence of respondent fatigue as the survey instrument remains quite long may also affect the quality and rate of response. Language and accessibility barriers also persist.
- 2) The rating scales provided in the survey may not have been used consistently by all respondents, especially across different cultures involved in the MOPAN assessment. One potential limitation is ‘central tendency bias’. Cultural differences may also contribute to this bias.

Administratively, the survey proved burdensome under the sub-contracted modality. Access to lists of respondents, response rates, and raw data was limited; transaction costs were high.

Some broader issues for consideration, which will feed into the proposed action plan include the following:

- the need to understand where and how multilaterals operate (level of presence) and what type of stakeholders engage at any given level (sampling, representativeness and size). A sample typology of stakeholders is available in Annex I.
- understanding what types of questions and what methods are best applied to type of respondent group (methods)
- cost-benefit analysis on various methods of soliciting inputs from external stakeholders (evaluation)

Reviewing the results assessment

Issue and scope of work

Results encompass different levels of delivery by organisations assessed along a chain, with a standard terminology separating outputs, outcomes, and impacts¹. The issue of attribution becomes more problematic the higher up the assessment goes along the chain and, starting at the outcome level, any assessment of results is rather about contribution. Another usual issue with results assessment is availability of data, related to transparency and systems in place.

The [Methodology Review](#) mentions a “limited coverage of results” in MOPAN assessments. Perceptions about this limitation come from three main angles:

- the MOPAN approach is seen as putting more emphasis on systems rather than effectively measuring the achievements;
- the evidence base for assessing results, especially at country level, is perceived as thin; and
- the focus on development and humanitarian results is not relevant to all organisations assessed.

In previous discussions, Members agreed working assumptions when assessing results: (i) secondary data collected through the documentary review will remain the basis for the results assessment, and (ii) this assessment will continue to be against the objectives that the institution sets to itself. While Members have emphasized the importance of assessing results, they have also recognised the complexity of doing so, and the importance, for sustainability, of keeping a significant focus on systems to measure results in the assessment.

The scope of work agreed for this task is making the assessment of results more comprehensive and explicit in line with Members’ information needs, on the basis of the above agreements.

Lessons learning

The initial version of the MOPAN 3.0 methodology included a preliminary review of the evaluation universe and quality for the organisation assessed. This combined: (i) an assessment of the credibility, including the independence, of the evaluation function; and (ii) an assessment of the coverage and quality of development effectiveness reporting. The review of the first cycle of implementation concluded that “challenges remain with the Results dimension (the OECD Development Effectiveness Review methodology) not being applicable to ‘atypical’ organisations/those with no formal evaluation function (namely the funds/partnerships).”

Consequently, it was decided an adaptation of the methodology to:

1. Remove the ex-ante assessment of evaluation function based on the OECD Development Effectiveness Review methodology.
2. Broaden (make explicit) sources of results information:
 - Independent evaluations;
 - External reviews/evaluations of the agency which include results;
 - Other internal or external reviews;

¹ As per the [OECD-DAC definitions](#): outputs are the products, capital goods and services which result from development interventions; outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term change and effects of intervention outputs; and impacts are the positive and negative, primary and secondary, long-term effects produced by development interventions.

- Management results (validated by independent evaluation);
- Management results (not validated by independent evaluation).

The [MOPAN 3.0 methodology manual for the 2017-2018 cycle](#) gives explicit indications about the generic criteria for including documents into the documentary review (Section 5 – Table 2). It also clarifies the process for selecting results documentation and stresses the differences in credibility between various types of documents. It highlights the range of sources from this perspective:

- **Annual Report on Development Results** at the organisational level. For International Financial Institutions (IFIs) this is often based on a review of project completion reports which may or may not have been audited for accuracy by the central evaluation group. For United Nations (UN) organisations this report may track SDG results across partner countries and may be supplemented by highlights from evaluations. For UN agencies it can usually be found in the documents submitted to the governing body at its main annual meeting.
- **An Annual Summary/Synthesis of Evaluation Results.** This is a common document among IFIs and some UN organisations and typically presents both extracted highlights and some statistical data on the coverage and results of evaluations published in a given year.
- **OECD Development Effectiveness Review**, which for some multilateral agencies provides a synthesis of development results, drawn from evaluations, for the organisation.
- **A Report on Progress towards the Objectives of the Strategic Plan.** This report is not necessarily issued annually. It can either relate to the biennial budget of an organisation or to a three to five year strategic plan of an IFI. It may be in a Scorecard or Results Framework report format.
- **Independent evaluations** commissioned by the organisation including a selection of:
 - Thematic evaluations
 - Strategic evaluations
 - Country/Regional evaluations
 - Programme evaluation
 - Any other relevant evaluation type
- **Evaluations or reviews conducted of the organisation and which include a summation of its results** (for example evaluations or reviews commissioned by bilateral donors)

Source: MOPAN 3.0 methodology manual for the 2017-2018 cycle, Section 5 – Box 6²

Proposals moving forward

1. *Slightly refine the list of acceptable documents for inclusion in the assessment of results*

The list of acceptable documents as presented in the methodology manual is complete and aligned to practice. It does not require substantive changes, but minor refinements are proposed so that:

- The list clarifies that country level secondary data can be included as relevant, with the understanding that the documentary review will still only include a manageable sample as per resources available;
- The DAC Evaluation Resource Center (DEReC) is explicitly mentioned as resource for collecting evaluation information, in particular country level evaluations.

² The last point in the box is valid although it has disappeared from the latest printed version of the methodology manual, hyperlinked in this note. This omission will be fixed in future versions.

2. *Include a preliminary collection of information related to the assessment of results as part of an enhanced inception phase*

The focus should be on an initial analysis of the universe of results data available including aligning sources to the assessment framework, and identifying gaps.

3. *Establish criteria for defining the level of confidence related to the assessment of results*

Making the decision on the level of confidence more transparent is required insofar as: (i) institutions understand the basis for the assessment of results, and (ii) users of the report understand the limitations related to this assessment and to the use of the information.

The proposed option moving forward is including an explicit rationale for the level of confidence set for the results assessment starting 2019. The approach for setting the level of confidence will be clarified and may combine different influencing factors including:

- the coverage of the documents included in the review against the objectives of the institution - this is related to the strength of systems as assessed by KPIs 7 and 8, but also to transparency;
- the quality of documents included in the review as judged by the assessment team;
- the proportion of self-reported versus independently reported results data used; and
- the ratings related to the results systems (KPIs 7 and 8).

Updating the methodology for alignment to the 2030 Agenda

Issue and scope of work

The 2030 Agenda with the 17 SDGs and 169 targets at its core provides an internationally agreed framework for development in all countries and constitutes a shift from a pure development agenda to a much broader sustainability agenda. The agenda covers a wide set of policy issues and is universal in character, thus as far as multilateral organisations are concerned, the agenda is a relevant and applicable framework for essentially all multilateral organisations. In light of this centrality, it becomes apparent that the multidimensionality and interconnectedness of the issues addressed by the 2030 Agenda ultimately alter the demands that multilateral organisations are required to fulfil. This offers the opportunity for a common analytical and monitoring framework, assessing how organisations position themselves in regards to the transformative character of the agenda and how they integrate its doctrine and principles in their respective line of work.

The current MOPAN methodology sets out Micro Indicator 1.3 and its underlying elements to investigate if the “strategic plan supports the implementation of wider normative frameworks and associated results”. Without explicit mentioning, the methodology applies a general phrasing that refers to any relevant international agreements, such as the 2030 Agenda. Further to this, the October 2015 Steering Committee also acknowledged the conceptualization of cross-cutting issues and how they are being assessed, employing KPI 2, as tangentially related to the SDGs. Applying MI 1.3 in the current assessment cycle, the Interim Document Reviews and HQ-Interviews have shown that the Agenda 2030 figures prominently in most organisations’ strategic thinking, planning and operationalisations, which will likewise be reflected in the final assessment reports.

The MOPAN Methodology Review nevertheless identified the need to adapt MOPAN’s methodology closer to the 2030 Agenda. By means of harmonizing its methodology in line with the SDGs, MOPAN’s subtle yet important contribution to the overall accountability framework for the 2030 Agenda lies in tracking the organisation’s preparedness, incorporation and operationalization of the agenda. Within this process it is integral for MOPAN to fully consider what it would like to explicitly measure and ultimately know about organisational performance vis-à-vis the 2030 Agenda/SDGs.

Proposals moving forward

Multilateral organizations are used to the rationale of a matrix structure of development goals, with (more or less isolated) development goals and cross-cutting issues (gender, environment, human rights etc.). Other than this, the 2030 Agenda requires a holistic approach with the set of SDGs and their interactions aiming at transformative change. The adaptation of the SDG framework within organizations’ strategies, procedures, instruments and operations therefore requires knowledge about the dynamics of transformative change and the interactions between SDGs (synergies, trade-offs) to accelerate the adjustment of organisations from the conventional development cooperation concept to the concept of transformative change.

At present, most international organisations have either just started to incorporate the Agenda 2030 or are in the preparatory phase of onboarding. With research and learning on the theoretical and

empirical level underway, international organisations are working to develop a clear agenda and vision regarding their own approaches to issues, such as priority and goal setting, knowledge management, strategy and instruments. This circumstance casts doubt on the appropriateness of a rigid evaluation exercise. An adequate assessment framework in this context evaluates and analyses whether an organisation is currently going through a rigorous and thorough internal process of recognizing, understanding and integrating the Agenda 2030.

In assuming assessment on whether an organization is indeed fit to deliver on the SDGs, the following options have been proposed and discussed:

Option 1: Adjust and amend elements throughout the methodology to align better to 2030 Agenda:

In aligning to the current indicator framework, analysis to identify which MIs and elements reflect practices that would serve as proxy measures on whether an organization is fit to deliver on the SDGs is a potential way forward. This would build upon the current MI 1.3, and focus on internal reflections, specific systems, practices, and behaviours that need to be in place to deliver on a transformational agenda. It however constitutes the least ambitious approach.

Option 2: Include an additional KPI in MOPAN Methodology framework as catalyst for accelerated organizational implementation and learning around the 2030 Agenda, or use this proposed framework for a potential case study:

In order to best understand whether systems are being shifted within an organisation, a temporary KPI in the “Strategic Planning Area” could be established (for purposes of this note, it is titled KPI X). This separate KPI would have a catalyst function for the adjustment and capacity building process that an organisation needs to switch to a holistic approach for development. This requires willingness, strategic change management adaptability and of course comprehensive learning and innovation. After about 5 years, the methodology should be revised to merge the additional KPI with KPI 2.

Suggestion for KPI X

KPI X would aim to encourage improvements with regard to

- Acquisition and exchange of data and knowledge within and between organisations to support transformative change according to the 2030 Agenda / SDGs
- Adjustment of strategies, implementation instruments and reporting concepts
- Contribution to global SDG monitoring frameworks

Option 3: Conduct a preparedness review to assess whether multilateral organisations have organised themselves in a way that will enable them to successfully deliver on the Agenda 2030 using a “stages of adaptation” framework:

Rather than simply assess an organisation’s current institutional arrangements, this proposed assessment framework (or something akin to it), takes a step back and likewise evaluates the underlying internal adaptation process an organisation is going through. This approach allows illustration of whether an organisation is aware of its context, responsibilities and implications and by incorporating these preceding introspective steps into an assessment, can organisations’ efforts be

truly considered fit for purpose. The outlined model draws from INTOSAI's "[Practical Guide to Government SDG Preparedness Reviews](#)" and serves as a tool for reviewing organisation's preparedness for implementing the Agenda 2030. It identifies seven steps for a rigorous and coherent adaptation process, giving space to the varying roles organisations can play within the global agenda:

The seven stage of the adaption process:

- I. Recognition of responsibility and commitment to the Agenda 2030*
- II. Understanding the Agenda 2030 and its implications for the organisation*
- III. Planning and capacity-building*
- IV. Organisational integration of the 2030 Agenda*
- V. Monitoring and reporting*
- VI. Coordination and partnership efforts*
- VII. Coherence and robustness of adaptation process*

The proposed tool could potentially be regarded as an analytical lens or angle for the assessment, whereby a specific and robust indicator framework is still to be developed, potentially drawing from the suggestions made in the additional KPI proposal (Option 2). The added value of conducting an assessment of the on-going process employing an adaptation angle, is to support an organisation in the development of a self-determined and well-thought through adaptation process. Gaining a comprehensive picture of the organisation's context and a self-developed understanding of its role within the agenda, will bring about enhanced decision-making, as well as internal traction and will lead to the development of a clear, effective and holistic agenda, vision and implementation within the organisation itself.

Updating the methodology for integrating safeguarding against SEA/SH

Issue and scope of work

The aim is to integrate aspects into the methodology that capture the ethical safeguards an organisation has in place, in particular against sexual exploitation and (sexual) abuse. As a basis for further discussion and reflection, this concept note was elaborated³, for the purpose of presenting options for integrating a dimension related to safeguarding ethical standards in the assessment framework. It also clarifies the terminology used, and makes a recommendation on delimiting the scope of safeguarding aspects included in assessments.

Discussions first focused on agreeing a scope of work.

SEAH

Focus on sexual exploitation and abuse, [sexual] harassment and other sexual misconduct (hereafter SEAH). Defining the scope of this revision was challenging. This is firstly because the scope could potentially be set wide and encompass a large number of issues. Mindful that the MOPAN methodology does not offer the place for such a broad assessment, and keen not to blur the focus, the group emphasized as a priority **safeguards to prevent, tackle, and support and provide justice for victims of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA) and Sexual Harassment (SEAH)**. At the same time they noted that they understood this in a wider context: of **ethics, human rights, abuse of power, of accountability** towards affected populations, and **duty of care** towards staff / personnel. The Group would however welcome the inclusion of further such aspects in subsequent revisions of the MOPAN methodology.

Definitions

Working definitions. The second challenge stems from the fact that there are no universally agreed definitions around the terms in question. For the purpose of this paper, we understand **safeguards** to be essential tools to prevent and mitigate undue harm. In risk management terminology, safeguarding would mean identifying risk, responding to it (prevention/ex-ante, and mitigating it (during and ex-post). **Safeguarding from sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment, and other sexual misconduct⁴** in multilateral development organisations, in our terminology, refers to ensuring that all those engaged in poverty reduction take all reasonable steps to *prevent* harm from sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment and other sexual misconduct; to *protect* people, especially vulnerable adults and children, from that harm; and to *respond* appropriately when harm does occur.⁵ Further definitions are in the Annex.

Keep it current

Constant updating of the approach in line with emerging best practice. A third challenge is that the debate on good practice in preventing, tackling and providing accountability for these issues is ongoing, and practice in flux. Significant steps are being taken by some organisations (e.g., UN and World Bank), and others are beginning to follow their lead by initiating early steps. Thus, while the MOPAN Task

³ This Concept Note benefitted from comments from the Task Team Member States France, Netherlands, and UK, as well as external experts, including from Reading University, UNRIS (IOM, UNFPA and FAO), IASC (AAP IASC Task Team), and OECD.

⁴ Note: “other sexual misconduct” is included because the terms SEA and SH, in their UN definitions used here, do not encompass the sexual abuse of multilateral organizational personnel or others for whom the organization may have a duty of care by other multilateral organizational personnel, particularly where for example, the alleged offender and victim may work for different multilateral entities. For definitions of SEA, SH, staff, personnel, and misconduct, see Annex III.

⁵ Definition from DfID; with addition of “other sexual misconduct” for the purpose of this concept note

Team puts this concept note forward as an interim proposal, it will need to be updated again soon in line with emerging consensus and standards. This will ensure that MOPAN continues to support accountability against common, international goals and standards of best practice.

Full cycle

Covering the full cycle. The Group decided that the methodological amendments should cover the **entire cycle** encompassing prevention, reporting, response, and communication. Covering only one aspect (e.g. prevention) would not allow MOPAN to understand an organisation’s true engagement / performance on this matter.

Policy and reality

Policy and practice. Similarly, while it would be easiest to track the simple **existence** of policies, guidance and mechanisms related to SEAH, this would not be sufficient to measure an organisation’s true performance on this matter. Any effective strategy to prevent, report on, respond to, and communicate on these issues needs to encompass *all* the actions at once. This means measuring not only the **existence** of policies, guidance, and mechanisms, but also the their **transparency**, ease of access for personnel and victims; the **training** of staff, the degree of **awareness** of staff and partners of these policies, the **quality, use, appropriateness and safety** of reporting mechanisms, **tracking / monitoring** of cases, **actual delivery** of victim assistance, **quality of communication** about SEAH. This will help get close to measuring the actual **outcomes of policies** in place.

What commitments of multilateral organisations could MOPAN draw on?

In the MOPAN methodology each indicator is based on a ‘reference point’, an international standard of good practice.⁶ This will also be a requirement for indicators on SEAH safeguarding. Many multilateral organisations have affirmed their commitment to combatting SEAH and fostering a respectful and positive working environment in response to an emerging agreement across the aid sector to raise standards. Efforts to identify good practice and set common standards are taking place on many fronts. This Concept Note draws on the following processes and will continue to monitor them so as to ensure its measurements reflect current requirements and best practice:

- **UN system-wide standards:** The [“Minimum Operating Standards: Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by own Personnel” \(2012\)](#) (hereinafter MOS-PSEA) were developed by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC)⁷ and adopted by the entire UN system.
- In response to IASC recommendations, the Secretary General’s bulletin on Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse (ST/SGB/2003/13) laid out 6 core principles on SEA⁸. This Bulletin, and the SG’s 2017 [“new approach”](#) strategy to combat sexual exploitation and abuse⁹, for the first time, address the issue as a system-wide one. It is also valid for all UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes, and other separately administered organs and programmes of the United Nations, and asks Agencies, Funds and Programmes to adopt new measures and

⁶ See [MOPAN 3.0, Methodology Manual 2017-18 cycle](#), p. 74 - 89

⁷ The IASC is the inter-agency coordination body of humanitarian assistance that involves key UN and non-UN humanitarian partners. Its Members are: UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR, WFP, FAO, WHO, UN-HABITAT, OCHA and IOM. Standing invitees: ICRC, IFRC, OHCHR, UNFPA, Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs, World Bank. The IASC’s Task Force on Accountability to Affected Populations and the Prevention of SEA (AAP/PSEA), leads the work in this area today.

⁸ The Bulletin provides definitions for key terms and defines the behaviour of UN staff and related personnel in relation to SEA. It underscores that SEA has always been unacceptable behaviour and prohibited conduct under the Staff Regulations and Rules. The Bulletin also applies to all partners, including NGOs, consultants, contractors, day labourers, interns, Junior Programme Officers (JPOs), and UN Volunteers (UNVs). It stipulates that when the UN enters into a contract with a non-UN entity, that entity must also agree to apply these standards as part of the terms of the contract. It promulgates six standards that are outlined in the Annex to this Concept Note.

⁹ (A/71/818 and A/71/818/Corr.1) in 2017

strengthen existing ones to better prevent, detect, report and take action against personnel who commit such acts. The SG reports on steps taken to implement the Special Measures every year.

- **Within the UN**, there are several entities that are driving further advancement of measures and standards, although they have not yet been endorsed UN-wide.
 - **Humanitarian organisations:** IASC Principals in late 2015 endorsed a Statement affirming their commitment to actively prevent and respond to SDA by humanitarian workers, and to fully implement the MOS-PSEA. In 2016 they endorsed a Global SOP on inter-agency cooperation in establishing inter-agency community-based complaint mechanisms (CBCMs).¹⁰ In late 2017, they made four [Commitments on Accountability to Affected Populations and Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse](#). In March 2018, the IASC AAP/PSEA Task Team adopted [Annexes](#) to the CAAP containing recommendations for Principals and Senior Managers for both the organisational and collective levels, as well as links to tools, guidance, and case studies. The recommendations contain very specific elements that Agencies should put in place.¹¹ It is not yet clear how the implementation of these will be monitored.
 - **UN Organisations involved in Peacekeeping and Special Political Missions:** Although the UN Standards of Conduct apply to all categories of personnel deployed in UN missions, peacekeeping and special political missions have adopted explicit and farther-reaching measures. The MoU between the UN and Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs) unequivocally lists the obligations of States regarding their troops' conduct and discipline. A Conduct and Discipline Unit (CDU) was established in 2005 and has since developed a number of valuable tools. The CDU is also the UN's front runner with regard to reporting. Since 2015, it publishes detailed quarterly statistics on **allegations of SEA by peacekeepers**, which provides more detail than the UN's overall annual report on allegations outside of peacekeeping (compiled in annexes to the annual SG's Special Measures Report since 2017).
 - The UN Secretary-General appointed a **UN Victims Rights Advocate** in mid-2017 in response to his pledge in his Special Measures report to strengthen the mechanisms and coordination in the UN system for assistance to victims of SEA.
- **Multilateral Development Banks / International Financing Institutions (IFIs)** have, in early 2018 and on the invitation of the UK and NL, made a [Joint Statement on Continuous Advancement of Standards to Prevent Sexual Harassment, Abuse, and Exploitation](#). MDBs typically require the application of safeguards to approve projects (e.g. the World Bank's Poverty and Social Impact Analysis, PSIA). Some of them have gone further. For instance, responding to recommendations by its Task Force on Global Gender-based violence,¹² the World Bank has developed an Action Plan¹³ to help prevent and respond to SEA and other forms of gender-based violence.

¹⁰ The [Global SOPs](#) are technical guidance on how agencies can coordinate complaint referrals while operating an inter-agency community-based complaint mechanism (CBCM). The SOPs cover how to receive, assess, refer, and follow-up on complaints between agencies in line with diverse confidentiality and data protection policies. It also includes agreed-upon good practices in agency collaboration based on the Best Practice Guide to Establish Inter-Agency Community-Based Complaint Mechanisms.

¹¹ Those are adapted from the 'Grand Bargain Participation Revolution Recommendations (GBPRR) to Promote Effective Participation of People Affected by Crisis in Humanitarian Decisions' and the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS).

¹² World Bank (2017), Working together to prevent SEA: Recommendations for World Bank investment projects, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/482251502095751999/pdf/117972-WP-PUBLIC-recommendations.pdf>

¹³ World Bank (2017), Global gender-based violence task force: Action plan for implementation, available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/206731510166266845/Global-gender-based-violence-task-force-action-plan-for-implementation>

- **Donors:** The IASC AAP/PSEA Task Team has issued [Key Messages for Donors on PSEA](#). Those are a valuable resource for this MOPAN exercise as they contain recommendations on what Donors should look out for, such as encouraging reporting whilst upholding the confidentiality of individual cases; and shifting reporting requirements from quantitative to qualitative. Underpinning the key messages is a plea that donors act jointly, i.e. have common standards, reporting requirements, and definitions (of PSEA, AAP etc.). The G7's [Whistler Declaration](#) on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in International Assistance on 2 June 2018, and the [statement](#) of the Development Ministers at their annual Tidewater meeting the same week, both contained a commitment to harmonizing standards and mechanisms to combat SEAH. The Donor Technical Working Group, convened by DfID, aims to develop and agree priority actions for collective donor action to improve SEAH safeguards in the international development sector.¹⁴ MOPAN will continue to monitor outcomes of these fora.

What entry points does the MOPAN methodology offer currently?

While MOPAN 3.0 covers a number of aspects related to ethics - including on financial (mis)conduct¹⁵, gender equality, human resources, and risk - it currently does not have any indicators explicitly referring to SEAH, as Annex II shows in more detail.

MOPAN 3.0's indicators and elements related to **gender equality** and the empowerment of women (MIs 2.1.a, 9.4) do ask for a dedicated policy statement on gender equality, the full integration of it into strategic planning and corporate objectives, accountability systems to reflect gender equality indicators and capacity development of staff "on gender" (MI 2.1a) and whether interventions resulted in improving gender equality (MI 9.4). However, there is no explicit mention of the prevention and addressing of SEAH.

MOPAN 3.0 has a component on **Human Resources**, and while it wants "HR systems and policies" to be "performance-based and geared to the achievement of results" (MI 3.4) it does not address the prohibition of SEAH.

Finally, MOPAN assesses in its Performance Area on Partnerships whether "detailed **risk** (strategic, political, reputational, operational) management strategies ensure the identification, mitigation, monitoring and reporting of risks" (MI 5.4). While issues SEAH safeguarding has a bearing on several risks, including reputational, the indicator has not, so far, been interpreted to cover organisational accountability for SEAH.

¹⁴ Source : Safeguarding Network : Donor Technical Group, Meeting Minutes (DfID), 28 March 2018

¹⁵ The indicators relating to **financial management** (and misconduct) look at whether "issues or concerns raised by internal control mechanisms (operational and financial risk management, internal audit, safeguards, etc.) [are] adequately addressed" (MI 4.5), and whether "policies and procedures effectively prevent, detect, investigate and sanction cases of fraud, corruption and other financial irregularities" (MI 4.6). However, MOPAN 3.0 has no equivalent indicators regarding inter-personal misconduct.

What aspects should the MOPAN methodology cover on SEAH?

The measures to prevent, tackle, and provide justice for (victims of) SEAH cover a wide range. MOPAN will need to structure them logically in order to build them into its methodology. Measures can be organised in different ways, as the following examples illustrate:

One is to use the UN's three-pronged strategy to address all forms of misconduct (including SEA): (1) [prevention of misconduct](#), (2) [enforcement of UN standards of conduct](#) and (3) [remedial action](#).

Another is to choose the four concepts "(1) Prevent, (2) Detect, (3) Address, (4) Communicate", visualised by UNFPA as the 'PSEA/SH Wheel' at its last Executive Board meeting, as a structure to categorise issues (see illustration).

Alternatively, the five key areas of the SG's "new approach" could serve as a structure, namely (1) Prioritizing the rights of victims; (2) Ending impunity, (3) Engagement with Member States, (4) Engagement with civil society, and (5) Improving strategic communications for education and transparency.



The PSEA/SH Wheel

(Source: UNFPA presentation to Joint Segment of UNDP/UNFPA/UNOPS EB, 4/6/18)

Drawing on the above categorisations, and on inputs from the group, the following **building blocks** on SEAH emerge as priorities for reflecting in the MOPAN methodology. They cover both principles (form) as well as operational matters (function). All of them require refinement, and need to be checked for measurability. They can form the basis for developing indicators in the next phase, as laid out in three options further below.

Given the rich and detailed input, an important next step in defining indicators will be to prioritize among the sub-components to be measured.

(1) Culture of prevention and zero tolerance:

- a. Prevention of SEAH (PSEAH) is part of the organisation's **value statement**
- b. It is an explicit priority of its **leadership**,
- c. organisation engages with others in sharing / exploring **best practice** related to SEAH
- d. Prevention of SEAH enshrined in **policy, Code of Conduct / Ethics Code**
- e. All categories of **personnel sign**, within their contracts, to abide by PSEAH obligations and to understand consequences of breach
- f. There is a **communications plan** on policies and codes that relate to SEAH to raise awareness of the rules, regulations, policies on this issue
- g. SEAH is part of the Organisation's risk management framework (specific SEAH risk assessment/protocols).
- h. Organisation has named **focal point(s) / person(s) / role** on SEAH
- i. Mandatory induction **training** is in place for all categories of staff and executing partners at all duty stations, with mandatory refresher courses
- j. **Community consultations** undertaken consistently to understand **risk factors** and , and to inform of expected behaviour of MO staff (all categories)
- k. **Human Resources** enforces enhanced screening of personnel in place and before hiring; checks and balances in staff-related processes

(2) Detecting / Reporting of allegations

- a. **Complaint mechanisms** (both for formal complaints and ‘all matters reported’) exist and have been designed and are regularly reviewed with meaningful participation of affected communities
- b. Organisation can demonstrate the **utility** of its complaint mechanisms
- c. Investigations undertaken transparently and with reporting to the victims [cf (5)]
- d. **Whistle-blower protection** policy covering SEAH exists and is being applied

(3) Victim/survivor-centred approach¹⁶

- a. MO has an explicit commitment to a victim/survivor-centred approach
- b. Funding for assistance is allocated, and measures in place to ensure it is adequate with review and feedback from affected communities
- c. Assistance is provided to victims (immediate and long-term)

(4) Organisational accountability / Enforcement

- a. Policies that are in place for organisational accountability (investigative function, justice, disciplinary sanctions, referral for criminal activity) are regularly reviewed (by an external evaluator) regarding their robustness
- b. Investigative function is adequately resourced (incl. specialized SEAH capacity)
- c. (depending on a.): Organisational accountability policies assessed (through 4.a) as being robust, fair and transparent, and supported with adequate capacity
 - i. If so, where allegations are reported, they are handled in line with the organisation’s policies, to the satisfaction of complainants (procedure-wise)
 - ii. If not, organisation taking / has taken steps to improve its frameworks

(5) Transparent reporting and communication

- a. Organisation releases a publicly available report annually on allegations and how they have been handled (for UN organisations: through joint report)
- b. Organisation acts without undue delays, and respects confidentiality of persons
- c. Organisation ensures that those involved in an allegation / case are informed (as appropriate) as swiftly as possible about reporting and progress of investigation, and are fully aware of their rights and responsibilities in the process.
- d. Participation in and support for UN/wider system of reporting and recording

¹⁶ Note that some additional aspects of a survivor/victim-centred approach are reflected in Building Block (5). See also Definition in Annex II.

Differentiating the methodology

Issue and scope of work

Members broadly agree that the MOPAN methodology should maintain a core set of indicators common across all types of organisations. Provided it keeps this good level of standardisation, some level of adaptation of the framework is acceptable, mostly, but not exclusively, in relation to the results component.

This concept note aims at constituting a basis for brainstorming and defining appropriate short to medium-term actions in relation to differentiating the methodology.

Lessons from the previous cycle and current practice

Based on lessons from the 2015-16 cycle, the [MOPAN 3.0 methodology manual for the 2017-18 cycle](#) provides some space for the adaptation and tailoring of the indicators to the institutions assessed. This space is limited as the working assumption is that “indicators in the revised framework have been formulated to explicitly adopt a generic model. Therefore, all or most indicators should apply to organisations under assessment, unless there is a clear evidence-based case of non-applicability.” The Methodology manual provides for a “maximum of five additional organisation-specific indicators [that] can be considered.” In applying the operating principle above, two specific situations are identified for tailoring:

1. “Where there is a clear case that the indicator does not apply to the organisation, i.e. is not part of their mandate or operating model, the indicator will be omitted.”
2. “Where the indicator can be applied, but requires adaptation for organisational relevance, it will remain unaltered, but a differential interpretation will be agreed and made explicit.”

In practice, differential interpretation has applied for cross-cutting issues such as governance, and there has been instances when micro-indicators have been added to assess specific cross-cutting issues for some organisation. Agreement for non-application to the organisation has occurred mostly at the element level.

The cross-assessment exercise conducted in 2017 also brought forward additional lessons, in particular that in areas of finance and results, “the methodological framework could do with better adaptation to the specific functioning of organisations, in particular MDBs and normative organisations.”

Finally, discussions during the Copenhagen seminar also included several points related to the differentiation subject. First “clustering organisations by thematic or operational group was discussed as a means to have a more differentiated assessment approach. Examples of criteria for clustering included strategic issues (e.g. organisations impacted by UN reform, the Grand Bargain, etc.), sector (e.g. health), and context of operations (e.g. organisations operating in fragile contexts).” A second interesting point from the same discussion was that “clustering can be done at two levels – either clustering for selection (within one cycle), or clustering for analysis (possibly over several cycles).” Finally, the discussion mentioned that “a possible adaptation of the assessment would be to distinguish between the relative “maturity” of the organisation in terms of its dynamism to ensure greater focus on areas which require more scrutiny.”

What do we mean by differentiation?

The previous section shows that different concepts are lumped together under the broad umbrella of differentiation/adaptation¹⁷. For structuring the work forward, this note identifies three options for differentiation:

1. Adapting the assessment framework (differentiation for specific types of organisations)

In a nutshell

While staying in the spirit of the current methodology, this option involves accepting adaptation of the assessment framework for specific groups (clusters) of organisations for higher relevance to the organisation assessed, beyond the limits set by the methodology today. This would be guided by general (new) rules but also by consultations with the organisation itself in the inception phase of the assessment.

Clustering

As suggested by the methodology review conducted end of 2017, organisations can be clustered depending on their main “task” within the multilateral system, and five are identified: (i) Service and Programme delivery, (ii) Finance, (iii) Capacity building (e.g. of policy and governance systems), (iv) Norm- and Standard setting, and (v) Coordination. The group has discussed an alternative clustering along main purposes: i) Service and programme delivery, possibly separated into (a) Development and b) Humanitarian; ii) Finance, and iii) Standard setting/Normative. It suggests that the latter is the approach tested in 2019, with a view to possible need for other clustering.

Adaptation approach- working assumptions

- The framework constituted by KPIs 1-8 is the core set of indicators and remains broadly stable at KPI and MI level, while the results component (KPIs 9-12) can change more substantially.
- The assessment framework will remain as much as possible uniform for the same cluster/type of organisations.

With the objective of keeping KPIs 1-8 and related MIs unchanged as much as possible, the proposed approach is reviewing elements¹⁸ when relevant for adaptation to the cluster considered. For example element 1 under MI 4.1 (“An explicit organisational statement or policy exists which clearly defines criteria for allocating resources to partners”) may require reformulation for banks, especially in the case of non-sovereign lending. With respect to KPIs 9-12, the proposed approach remains more flexible with the possibility to review the formulation of KPIs, MIs and rating scale.

2. Enriching the assessment framework in relation to a specific additional thematic issues (thematic differentiation)

In a nutshell

¹⁷ This note will not get into the discussing semantics and difference between adaptation and differentiation but focus on practical implications for methodological work.

¹⁸ Referring to the detailed content of each MI om the MOPAN 3.0 Methodological Manual for 2017-2018 assessments.

While the previous option was about adapting the core framework to specific types of institutions, this is about defining new sections in the assessment framework (KPIs 1-8) for assessing / analysing a special theme.

Clustering

The clustering in this case is thematic and defined in relation to the purpose of the additional section of the assessment framework. The additions potentially apply to different clusters of organisations, independently of their main purpose as described in the previous option. This means it could apply to a heterogenic group of organisations from the point of view of the above clustering. For example, additions to the assessment framework to measure preparedness to the 2030 agenda may apply to all types of organisations, for example multilateral development banks and specialised UN agencies.

Adaptation approach- working assumption

This option does not apply for the results component (KPI 9-12). The proposed approach is using additional MIs under KPIs 1-8, or as needed, additional KPIs complementing the organisational performance part of the assessment. The additional KPIs/MIs will constitute new modules that can be selected for application for any organisation.

3. Adapting the assessment process (differentiation for organisations assessed several times)

In a nutshell

This option is about exploring alternative assessment processes with a cost-efficiency objective. Some organisations have been assessed in multiple instances and experience that for those already at a quite high level of performance, successive assessments at best do not deliver benefits commensurate to the cost of the assessment, or worse do not add value at all. This option could also apply when the assessment is conducted for a special objective, for example measuring progress on a specific set of areas for improvement.

Clustering

By the nature of accountability relationship between multilateral organisations and bilateral funders, those organisations that receive a high volume of funding are likely to be prioritised for MOPAN assessments. Within this group, some organisations have been successively assessed at satisfactory and above. This combination of likelihood of frequent assessment and good performance over time defines the cluster of organisations that are candidates for adapting the assessment process.

Adaptation approach

Two possible approaches have been previously discussed, that can be combined as well: (i) self-assessment, and (ii) focused assessment on specific areas of performance, for example areas for improvement put forward by the previous assessment.

Annex I: Sample categorization of external stakeholders

Beneficiaries: while feedback from beneficiaries would be invaluable in understanding the impact of the organisations performance at country level, this information is quite difficult to obtain. First, one would have to be clear on who the beneficiary was e.g. is it the delivery partner or is it the individual receiving the service? (layers/levels of impact and results); Also, if you identified the beneficiary they may not be able to identify the MO's role in the programme they were benefitting from. The difficulty and challenges in obtaining this evidence could lead to less evidence in country than MOPAN has to date. It is still valuable, but requires further thought and analysis, and expertise – from the selected consultancy if they have relevant expertise or through other sources if possible (such as some research institute, consultancy, or pool of external experts). Finally, the methods in which beneficiaries are best reached also need to be considered, as a generic, online survey on organisation policies, procedures, etc. would likely be misdirected.

Country governments, and regional/local government structures, if appropriate: this group is often considered one of the main customers for the work of multilaterals at country level. At present MOPAN seeks to obtain views from these partners via the survey; they are provided by the multilateral focal points.

MOs direct partners in country (e.g. implementers of the programmes – these may be other multilateral organisations, NGOs, bilateral partners, the private sector or government bodies): feedback from this group could provide strong evidence of how the MO operates in country and what it is like in practice to work with the multilateral. This group may also hold informed views on the processes and procedures the MOs have put in place to demonstrate their organisational effectiveness and management of their results, or whether, for example, they do demonstrate strong grasp of costs in the field.

Civil society/NGOs: International NGO Forums exist in many developing countries and their membership would provide a good source of information about the delivery of particular partners; and in some way would be a proxy for beneficiary feedback. Different NGOs would need to be selected depending on the MO being assessed.

MOPAN member representatives (donors/embassies): this group is important for sharing their perceptions on relationship management, both with the MO and also with other donors. However, given that their views are directly accessible to MOPAN members, these are less of a priority. In other ways, this constituency could provide broader strategic inputs to MOPAN by understanding what information needs exist and are being requested of the MOs on a bilateral basis.

Governing body constituencies (MOPAN and non-MOPAN members): while this constituency is not always considered 'external' to the organisation, it serves as a constituency with intimate knowledge on the management and strategic direction of the organisation. Collecting views from all representation of governing bodies will also provide a holistic lens on the diverse vantage points of an organisation, and my point to tensions that are then played out in practice via management and operations.



Other types of partners to consider: knowledge partners, procurement partners, operational partners, financing partners, etc.

Annex II: Current coverage / entry points in MOPAN Methodology

The current version of the [MOPAN 3.0 methodology](#) includes several aspects pertaining to ethics and conduct issues that have been considered at the early stages of developing this concept note, as possible hooks, or models to be replicated with an SEAH angle. This table only takes a retrospective look and does not attempt to explain how the SEAH indicators would be integrated or measured.

	Indicator (and elements) as currently reflected in Methodology MOPAN 3.0	Comment
2.1 a	<p>Gender equality and the empowerment of women:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dedicated policy statement on gender equality available and showing evidence of use 2. Gender equality indicators and targets fully integrated into the organisation's strategic plan and corporate objectives 3. Accountability systems (including corporate reporting and evaluation) reflect gender equality indicators and targets 4. Gender screening checklists or similar tools used for all new Interventions 5. Human and financial resources (exceeding benchmarks) are available to address gender issues 6. Capacity development of staff on gender is underway or has been conducted 	<p>This Micro-Indicator could become a model for treating 'ethics' as a cross-cutting issue, with components that draw on different Performance Areas, but are anchored in MI 2.1a.</p> <p>Also, the existing gender indicator could be used to highlight any potential disconnect between an organisation's gender policies and its practices in staff behaviour.</p> <p><i>Limitation: While this indicator could capture gender-related and SEAH-related issues, its potential to measure broader ethics issues would be limited.</i></p>
3.4	<p>HR systems and policies performance based and geared to the achievement of results.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A system is in place which requires the performance assessment of all staff, including senior staff 2. There is evidence that the performance assessment system is systematically and implemented by the organisation across all staff and to the required frequency 3. The performance assessment system is clearly linked to organisational improvement, particularly the achievement of corporate objectives, and to demonstrate ability to work with other agencies 4. The performance assessment of staff is applied in decision making relating to promotion, incentives, rewards, sanctions, etc. 5. A clear process is in place to manage disagreement and complaints relating to staff performance assessments 	<p>This indicator is the main one covering HR performance issues in MOPAN 3.0. It could be expanded to include (a) ethics issues in staff behaviour (e.g. how adherence to code of conduct is monitored and enforced), (b) how the organisation records incidents of serious misconduct, and (c) how it uses and shares such information for hiring processes (including references).</p> <p>Corresponding elements would need to be added.</p> <p><i>Limitation: HR indicators would need to be complemented by other indicators, including those capturing safeguards vis-à-vis partners / service providers, etc.</i></p>
4.5	<p>Issues or concerns raised by internal control mechanisms (operational and financial risk management, internal audit, safeguards, etc.) adequately addressed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear policy / organisational statement exists on how any issues identified through internal control mechanisms will be addressed 2. Management guidelines / rules provide clear guidance on the procedures for addressing any identified issues, including timelines 3. Clear guidelines are available for staff on reporting any issues identified 4. A tracking system is available which records responses and actions taken to address any identified issues 5. Governing Body or management documents indicate that relevant procedures have been followed / action taken in response to identified issues, including recommendations from audits (internal and external) 6. Timelines for taking action follow guidelines / ensure the addressing of the issue within 12 months following its reporting. 	<p>This indicator is placed under the finance KPI, although internal control frameworks go beyond financial aspects. This bears the risk that internal control is reduced to financial matters and ignores non-financial functions.</p> <p>Notably, inter-personal issues are not included here. Also, no equivalent exists for inter-personal issues elsewhere in the methodology.</p> <p>MI 4.5 and its individual elements contain a helpful structure for elements that could be replicated for other, inter-personal ethics issues.</p>

<p>4.6</p>	<p>Element 5: There are channels / mechanisms in place for reporting suspicion of misuse of funds (e.g. anonymous reporting channels and 'whistle-blower' protection policy)</p>	<p>Whistle-blower protection policies should protect not only those bringing forward allegations of <i>financial</i> misconduct, but also those reporting potential <i>inter-personal</i> misconduct. MOPAN's methodology does not yet cover whistle-blower protection beyond financial issues. This element would need to be either replicated for inter-personal misconduct, or its scope enlarged.¹⁹</p>
<p>5.4</p>	<p>Detailed risk (strategic, political, reputational, operational) management strategies ensure the identification, mitigation, monitoring and reporting of risks</p>	<p>SEAH constitutes a particularly virulent threat to organisations' ability to effectively carry out their mandate. The risk indicator would provide an entry point from a perspective of reputational and operational risk.</p>

¹⁹ A relevant source for MOPAN's further work in this area will be the JIU report on whistle-blower policies, https://www.unjiu.org/sites/www.unjiu.org/files/jiu_rep_2018_4_english_0.pdf

Annex III: Terminology

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.²⁰

Sexual abuse means the actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, whether by force or under unequal or coercive conditions.²¹

- *All sexual activity with a child (as defined under the UN Convention of the rights of the Child as any person under the age of 18) is considered as sexual abuse, regardless of the age of majority or consent locally; or any mistaken assumptions that a person is older. "Physical intrusion" is understood to mean "sexual activity".*
- *"Sexual abuse" is a broad term, which includes a number of acts described below, including "rape", "sexual assault", "sex with a minor", and "sexual activity with a minor".²²*
- *Any actual or attempted abuse of 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. Comment: "Sexual exploitation" is a broad term, which includes a number of acts described below, including "transactional sex", "solicitation of transactional sex" and "exploitative relationship".²³*

Sexual harassment is defined as any form of unwanted verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person, in particular when creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment.²⁴, In context of the UN, primarily describes prohibited behaviour against another UN staff or related personnel, which may also include nationals of the host state. It is defined for UN staff by ST/SGB/2008/5 and similar directives for uniformed personnel and involves any unwelcome sexual advance, request for sexual favour, verbal or physical conduct or gesture of a sexual nature, or any other behaviour of a sexual nature that might reasonably be expected or be perceived to cause offence or humiliation to another, when such conduct interferes with work, is made a condition of employment or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work environment. Beyond UN regulations, the definition of sexual harassment is broader and does not require a link to the work environment.

Safeguarding : Definitions of "safeguarding" vary, and can cover both institutional safeguards (a process to prevent harm being perpetrated by individuals employed or contracted by an organisation) and programmatic safeguarding (a process and systems aimed at identifying, avoiding, minimising and mitigating harm to people and / or the environment). The concept of safeguarding is generally applied broadly across social and environmental concerns, though often with a focus on specific thematic safeguarding areas, such as climate change, ecosystems services, labour rights, infrastructure, community health, gender based violence, human rights, and so on. These are routinely used by Multilateral Development Banks as part of their lending standards or project approval checklists. Currently, there is a groundswell of concern about safeguarding

²⁰ Source: UN Secretary-General's Bulletin on protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) (ST/SGB/2003/13)

²¹ Source: UN Secretary-General's Bulletin on protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) (ST/SGB/2003/13)

²² Source: UN Glossary on SEA, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/un_glossary_on_sea.pdf

²³ Source: UN Glossary on SEA, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/un_glossary_on_sea.pdf

²⁴ Source: UN Glossary on SEA, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/un_glossary_on_sea.pdf

against sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment and improving measures and accountability in this area.

DfID's terminology for 'safeguarding' is: to "ensure all those engaged in poverty reduction take all reasonable steps to prevent harm, particularly sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment from occurring; to protect people, especially vulnerable adults and children, from that harm; and to respond appropriately when harm does occur.

Ethics: According to the Ethics Guide of the United Nations, this concept encompasses applying an ethical framework, and making ethical decisions. The ethical framework of the UN includes ethical aspects in Carrying out the UN Mission (impartiality, respect for national laws, zero tolerance for SEA), Avoiding Conflicts of Interest (Personal Relationships, gifts and hospitality, external activities, working with partners, political activity, financial disclosure etc), and Protecting UN Resources (UN assets and resources, technology, vehicles etc.), and Creating a Harmonious Workplace (Mutual Rights, Duties, Non-Discrimination, Avoiding Harassment and Abuse of Authority) and finally Protecting Information and intellectual property.²⁵

Staff: According to the High-Level Committee on Management (HLCM) of the UN, the term 'staff' refers to all individuals holding letters of appointment in accordance with staff regulations and rules of the UN organizations (including both international and locally-recruited staff), regardless of their types of appointment (fixed term, continuing/permanent, temporary appointment).²⁶

Personnel: According to the High-Level Committee on Management (HLCM) of the UN, the term 'personnel' refers to all staff, as defined above, and other individuals with a contractual relationship with the Organizations (e.g. consultants, individual contractors, interns, UN Volunteers), in line with the definition used in the United Nations Security Management System.²⁷

Zero-tolerance policy on SEA: The UN policy establishing that sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel is prohibited and that every transgression will be acted upon.²⁸

Misconduct: Misconduct For UN staff members, misconduct may arise through the failure by a staff member to comply with his or her obligations under the Charter of the UN, the Staff Regulations and Staff Rules or other relevant administrative issuances or to observe the standards of conduct expected of an international civil servant. Sexual exploitation and abuse constitutes serious misconduct and may lead to the institution of a disciplinary process and the imposition of disciplinary measures. [...] For personnel other than those mentioned above, misconduct is defined as per the instruments that regulate their conduct.²⁹

Victim: According to the UN Glossary on SEA, a **Victim** is commonly understood to be a person who is, or has been, sexually exploited or abused. In the implementation of General-Assembly mandated activities, an individual, whose claims that he/she has been sexually exploited or abused by UN staff or related personnel have been established through a UN administrative process or Member States' processes, as appropriate. Comment: Different definitions of victim trigger different consequences; therefore it is important to use them contextually.

²⁵ Source: http://www.un.org/en/ethics/pdf/putting_ethics_to_work_en.pdf

²⁶ Source : <https://www.unsystem.org/content/duty-care>

²⁷ Source : <https://www.unsystem.org/content/duty-care>

²⁸ Source: UN Glossary on SEA, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/un_glossary_on_sea.pdf

²⁹ Source: UN Glossary on SEA, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/un_glossary_on_sea.pdf

Survivor: Reference is made to the term “victim” above. ‘Victim’ is a term often used in the legal and medical sectors, while the term ‘survivor’ is generally preferred in the psychological and social support sectors to a person who has experienced sexual or gender-based violence because it implies resilience.³⁰

Survivor-centred approach: As described in the UN Glossary on SEA, “an approach that acknowledges that survivors are usually less concerned with the distinctions between different parts of the UN/NGO/IGO community than they are with accessing services through clear and simple procedures and in a fair manner.”³¹ For the purposes of this paper, we understand it to be an approach that seeks to empower survivors/victims by speaking to their rights: not to be re-traumatized by the investigative/justice process; to have advocates providing services and support in various forms (including psycho-social, legal, or liaison with law enforcement); and to allow them to feel engaged and part of the process, to see perpetrators brought to justice and justice done.

³⁰ Source: UN Glossary on SEA, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/un_glossary_on_sea.pdf

³¹ Source: UN Glossary on SEA, https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/un_glossary_on_sea.pdf