OUTCOMES DOCUMENT –
SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE ROUNDTABLE

Canberra - December 2016

	? ISSUES / QUESTIONS RAISED	💡 PROPOSED SOLUTIONS / IDEAS	FURTHER POTENTIAL RESEARCH QUESTIONS
PREVENTION	▪ 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. ▪ 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. ▪ Would reduced exposure in relation to both time (length of deployments) and contact with communities limit SEA?	▪ Engage both the head and heart to ensure leadership engagement on SEA. It is important leadership understand individual and community impact ▪ Understand positive deviance e.g. TCC with low level of SEA e.g. Rwanda and Australia ▪ Strengthen whistle-blower protection ▪ Create stronger accountability mechanisms (including for individuals "rate my humanitarian" based on AirBnB model) ▪ Plug SEA better into WPS and PoC agendas	▪ What are the characteristics of TCCs with low levels of reported SEA (e.g. Australia, Rwanda, Uruguay)? What are they doing differently? ▪ 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? ▪ How does the community contribute to accountability mechanisms in relation to SEA (defining acceptable behaviours; knowing when and how to report)? ▪ 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? ▪ 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.
RESPONSE	▪ Need to work on the stigma associated with SEA that prevents TCC from reporting and dealing with it adequately ▪ Issues defining justice for SEA – who defines it and is it adequate to have perpetrators repatriated? Where do victim/survivor needs fit? ▪ Documentation of cases – are the right categories being used to capture the SEA perpetrated? ▪ 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?	▪ 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. ▪ Involve survivors more in the definition of justice and decisions about what responses are appropriate in the local context/ ▪ Improved documentation about SEA allegations, including greater transparency on how cases are categorised. Introduction of clearer categories of SEA? ▪ Recognise the interconnected nature of the causes and consequences of SEA, rather than seeing it as a simple conduct and discipline issue.	