

# OUTCOMES DOCUMENT – SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE ROUNDTABLE

Canberra - December 2016

PREVENTION

RESPONSE

 ISSUES / QUESTIONS RAISED	 PROPOSED SOLUTIONS / IDEAS	FURTHER POTENTIAL RESEARCH QUESTIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considering the social and legal context in troop contributing countries is crucial to understanding how it impacts the behaviour of interveners in deployment country context.</li> <li>Supply and demand: the challenge for the UN to fulfil the demand for PK troops may affect how policies that involve repatriation of troops or contingents responsible for SEA are implemented.</li> <li>Would reduced exposure in relation to both time (length of deployments) and contact with communities limit SEA?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage both the head and heart to ensure leadership engagement on SEA. It is important leadership understand individual and community impact</li> <li>Understand positive deviance e.g. TCC with low level of SEA e.g. Rwanda and Australia</li> <li>Strengthen whistle-blower protection</li> <li>Create stronger accountability mechanisms (including for individuals “rate my humanitarian” based on AirBnB model)</li> <li>Plug SEA better into WPS and PoC agendas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the characteristics of TCCs with low levels of reported SEA (e.g. Australia, Rwanda, Uruguay)? What are they doing differently?</li> <li>How has the changed nature of peacekeeping impacted on SEA – in particular the increased community engagement / reduced separation between interveners and affected populations, and the turn to more ‘robust’ or ‘muscular’ PKOs which involves greater power differentials?</li> <li>How does the community contribute to accountability mechanisms in relation to SEA (defining acceptable behaviours; knowing when and how to report)?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to work on the stigma associated with SEA that prevents TCC from reporting and dealing with it adequately</li> <li>Issues defining justice for SEA – who defines it and is it adequate to have perpetrators repatriated? Where do victim/survivor needs fit?</li> <li>Documentation of cases – are the right categories being used to capture the SEA perpetrated?</li> <li>Do those responsible for responding to SEA allegations have adequate training, resourcing and authority? Could the UN and NGOs work together better in this process?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Countries like Australia, Canada and Uruguay can act as role models by dealing with SEA allegations transparently and sharing lessons learned on effective reporting, investigation and response procedures.</li> <li>Involve survivors more in the definition of justice and decisions about what responses are appropriate in the local context/</li> <li>Improved documentation about SEA allegations, including greater transparency on how cases are categorised. Introduction of clearer categories of SEA?</li> <li>Recognise the interconnected nature of the causes and consequences of SEA, rather than seeing it as a simple conduct and discipline issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can training materials be redeveloped to shift from a conduct and discipline focus to one that incorporates broader issues around the intersecting causes and consequences of SEA? How can international best-practice from countries that have been more effective in preventing and responding to SEA be incorporated?</li> <li>How could localisation affect SEA rates and responses? E.g. if there is a concrete commitment to using more national staff (both UN and NGO) this may lead to changed power dynamics which may address underlying causes/ structures of SEA perpetration.</li> </ul>