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A. Introduction

A meeting on the *Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse* was attended by 21 participants (15 from the field and 6 from headquarters). A list of participants is provided as Annex 1. The meeting was facilitated by CARE USA’s Senior GED Advisors, Madhuri Narayanan and Amelia Kinahoi Siamomua and a consultant, Joan Connors. The meeting’s objective was to strengthen staff capacity to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA), establish plans to address gaps and sharpen the understanding and integration of prevention of SEA within CARE. Background to CARE International’s global commitment to the prevention of SEA is provided under Annex 2.

On Day 1, the meeting progressively built a common working understanding of the basic terms and concepts through interactive dialogues and from experiences in CARE on efforts to prevent SEA and gender-based violence (GBV).

On Day 2, the meeting discussed key findings and recommendations of a review of CARE’s work to prevent SEA (hereinafter referred to as the Review) and planned next steps by considering issues of capacity, of accountability; and organizational gaps in building a common understanding of “zero based tolerance” as demonstrated by behavior, applications of policies, and CARE’s work internally and programmatically.

On Days 3 and 4, the meeting consolidated the work of Day 2 and identified key practical plans to implement the recommendations from the Review for taking forward the work to prevent SEA. An overview of the four-day agenda is provided as Annex 3.

B. Highlights of the Review Findings

- A key barrier to recognizing and responding to SEA, and to understanding existing policies, is the widespread confusion between sexual harassment, SEA and GBV. Staff often mistakenly understand sexual harassment and SEA as behaviors that fall along a continuum with sexual exploitation and, ultimately, sexual abuse, as progressively more serious forms of sexual harassment. Staff tend to use it interchangeably without regard to the different implications for organizational accountability for each.
- CI Secretariat and all CI lead members have adopted headquarters-level policies and codes of conduct – which staff members are required to sign – prohibiting harassment, discrimination, exploitation and abuse. The members also have adopted policies on accountability toward program participants.

- An impressive 80 per cent of country offices report having adopted similar policies and codes of conduct contextualized for their particular setting. Leaders in the country offices have created environments conducive to dialogue such that staff have developed culturally relevant policy and code adaptations.

- However, Member policies omit some of the six core principles on SEA prevention and response adopted in 2002 by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Task Force (IASC) and reaffirmed by CI in December 2006 in the high-level UN and Non-UN Statement of Commitment on Eliminating Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (refer annex 4).

- Standards of conduct for staff vary by member. CARE-USA staff members, for example, are “strongly discouraged” from having sexual relationships with project participants. Their CARE-Canada colleagues, however, are prohibited from such sexual relationships but, should one develop, they are expected to discuss the matter with their supervisor who will determine whether an “alternative suitable work arrangement” can be found. Different yet, CARE-Australia staff acknowledge in their code of conduct the “inherent conflict of interest and potential abuse of power” in having sexual relationships with members of communities CARE works with. If they find themselves, however, in such a sexual relationship that they consider “non-exploitative and consensual,” they are instructed to disclose the fact to their supervisor “for appropriate guidance.” A table of comparison of standards is provided in annex 5.

- Contextualization has led to improved staff relations and work environments while inadvertently weakening protection of vulnerable women and children.
Despite the time, staff energy and resources CARE has devoted to PSEA, it is not possible to determine the extent of SEA in CARE programs at present. The absence of coordination and clear oversight and accountability within the confederation and within members themselves on PSEA hampers CARE’s efforts, leaving project participants and communities vulnerable to abuse and the organization uncertain to what extent its efforts have been effective.

C. Summaries of Dialogue of Days 1-4

Group Exercise

The participants were given the opportunity to practice the learning from the earlier sessions and work on scenarios adapted from materials from the HAP International’s Building Safer Organizations Investigation Learning Program and findings from the field visit undertaking during the recent SEA Review. Participants were requested to examine the scenarios to identify standards that apply to each scenario and explore gaps and make recommendations as to how to address such gaps. Annex 6 provides the scenarios and case studies used for clarifying definitions and standards.

The discussion on Day 1 centered on the definitions of sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse, and SGBV and laid the foundation for the remaining days of the meeting. These definitions as per the UN Secretary General’s Bulletin are:

**Sexual harassment (SH)** - Any unwelcome, usually repeated and unreciprocated sexual advance, unsolicited sexual attention, demand for sexual access or favours, sexual innuendo or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, such as display of pornographic material, when it unreasonably interferes with work, is made a condition of employment or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work environment.

**Sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA)**

**Sexual exploitation** - the abuse of a position of vulnerability, differential power, or trust for sexual purposes; this includes profiting monetarily, socially or politically from the sexual exploitation of another.

**Sexual abuse** - the actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, including inappropriate touching, by force or under unequal or coercive conditions.

**Sexual and Gender-based violence (SGBV)** - is violence that is directed against a person on the basis of gender or sex. It includes acts that inflict physical, mental, or sexual harm or suffering, threats of such acts, coercion and other deprivations of liberty. While women, men, boys, and girls can be victims of gender-based violence, women and girls are the main victims.

The following graphic further clarifies these terms and their relationship to each other and application.
SH, SEA, SGBV – How do they relate to each other?

CI Accountability Framework

Mark Flegenheimer of CI Secretariat presented on the CI’s accountability framework that is developed through a partnership between CARE and the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) International. The framework is an approach to enforce common standards and its applications (minimum standards that all CARE members and our “humanitarian workers” would adhere to). The accountability framework consists of 3 components: (i) Humanitarian standards; (ii) Compliance and (iii) Monitoring and Performance Metrics. For the full presentation, please contact Marc (flegenheimer@careinternational.org).

The meeting noted that although it is good that this accountability framework will be useful to advance accountability to PSEA standards in the course of CARE’s emergency relief work there is a need to ensure that there are sustainable mechanisms in place that will continue after the emergency response, especially in places that are prone to continual emergencies.

PSEA OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK

The operational framework developed to provide guidance to CARE to approach the work in PSEA in a holistic manner and in a phased manner was presented and served as an important tool to guide discussions and develop a plan of action.
D. Country Office Experiences

Six Country Office staff from Bangladesh, Burundi, India, Jordan, Mozambique and Peru shared their experiences of advancing PSEA including key efforts, successes, challenges and further support required. The experiences demonstrated the complexities and challenges that exist in the diverse environments in which CARE works and the multiple approaches being employed by different country offices and work that remains to be done. For more information on the, we encourage you to get in touch with the staff from the respective COs using the contact information provided in Annex 1.

E. Outcome of Meeting

Key actions for follow-up that resulted from meeting are as follows:

E.1 Proposed Draft Policy/Code of Conduct for CI

The Review recommended that the National Directors Committee should adopt a single CI-level SEA prevention and response policy and Code of Conduct. Sexual harassment should be addressed in a separate policy. Already a key recommendation of the SCHR Peer Review, efforts have been underway since late 2007 to establish a common policy.

A draft common policy was discussed and revised during the meeting. This draft policy will be further circulated for comments before a near-final one is submitted to the National Directors.
Marc Flegenheimer who was at the meeting from the Secretariat, will be briefing the CARE International Secretary General on this and the Secretariat is expected to pursue the next steps with the National Directors.

E.2 Draft Key Actions for Implementation

Based on the Review findings, country office experiences and the draft plan of action developed by interaction subgroup on SEA amongst others, the meeting identified key actions for the rest of FY08, FY09 and FY10. These actions will be further prioritized and refined depending on the available human and financial resources. Participants were encouraged to use (as appropriate) the key actions for future plans and budgeting exercises, and would also contribute to the AOP of the GED Team leading the work to prevent SEA. The consolidated plan provided in Annex 7 has been updated since the meeting to ensure alignment with the CARE operational framework and the draft plan developed by the InterAction working group on SEA.

E.3 SEA Advisory Group

Participants discussed the composition and role of the SEA advisory group and offered suggestions:

- Clarify the SEA Advisory Group’s mandate as a CI one and motivate members to ensure representation on the group
- Revise the terms of reference to emphasize its advisory role and constitute an additional working group, if required, to implement and monitor implementation of specific tasks

E.4 Questions for further exploration

The discussions during the four days threw-up several key areas for further exploration and clarification; few of these are listed below:

- How can CARE ensure compliance to international PSEA standards if national laws in the countries where we operate do not support those?
- How do we as an organization hold our partners to the same standards? What should be the role of CARE in sexual harassment or exploitation involving partner staff?
- How to ensure protection of staff from sexual exploitation or abuse by beneficiaries?
- What should be the role of CARE with regard to staff involved in violence in their personal lives either as abusers or survivors?

F. The Way Forward

This SEA Review and Planning meeting provided an important opportunity for taking stock of the progress and gaps; clarifying and reinforcing the basics and for paving a new course of action to be more effective in our PSEA efforts. The concrete outputs of the meeting and more importantly, the new understanding and relationships forged during the four days will serve as an important milestone in CARE’s long term journey to fulfill its internal and public commitment to prevention and response to sexual exploitation and abuse of the vulnerable people that we seek to empower and support in their fight against poverty and social injustice.
Annex 1

List of Participants

1. ABU-QUDARI, Areej    C-Jordan
2. BENNETT, Josephine    CI-UK
3. CHOWDHURY, Munmune    C-Bangladesh
4. CLINTON, Laura Lea    C-USA-HQ (HR)
5. FLEGENHEIMER, Marc    CI Secretariat
6. HASHEM, Atiqua    C-USA-HQ (Legal)
7. IRIGOYEN, Marina    CARE-Peru
8. NARAYANAN, Madhuri,    C-USA-HQ (GED)
9. NOMBORA, Gerson    C-Mozambique
10. NTAWUNDORA, Ida    C-Burundi
11. PEACOCK, Kate    C-Egypt
12. PINAULT, Delphine    C-Rwanda
13. REWALD, Michael    C-USA-HQ (Global Support and Partnership)
14. SAMUEL, Moses    C-India
15. WAREHAM, Rachel    CI-Austria
16. BRYAN, Nancy    C-USA-HQ (Global Support Services)
17. CONNORS, Joan    (Consultant)
18. MURAI, Anne    C-USA-HQ (HR)
19. SIAMOMUA, Amelia    C-USA-HQ (GED)
20. SOLOMON, Patrick    C-USA-HQ (Global Support Services)
21. THABET, Vivian    C-Egypt
22. FORDHAM, Walter    C-USA-HQ (HR)
23. V. Weerasingham (Weere)    C-Sri Lanka
Background to CARE International’s Global Commitment to Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA)

With the reported cases of sexual exploitation of beneficiaries by humanitarian aid workers in Africa in February 2002, CARE USA set up a Task Force Set-up to investigate and make recommendations. In 2003, Madhuri Narayanan, GED Advisor was tasked to coordinate the implementation of the Task Force recommendations. Since 2006, she received some assistance from the other Gender Advisor (Amelia Siamomua) with regards to capacity building/training, US-based cooperation and collaboration, and review of implementation. With the new organizational structure, they are now both working as the GED Team under Global Support Services to pursue efforts in this area.

CARE USA participates actively in InterAction’s working group on SEA. InterAction also works in partnership with the Building Safer Organization project of the Humanitarian Accountability Project International (HAP-I) in Geneva and has organized a series of trainings on investigating and documenting allegations of SEA for both field investigators and managers, and CARE staff have been trained through these courses and are also been certified as trainers.

CARE International participated in a peer review conducted by the Standing Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR) in Peer Review Recommendations in 2006. CARE USA has led and initiated work with the CI Secretariat and other Members to formally adopt common standards/Code of Conduct (COC) on sexual exploitation.

CARE USA also represented CI at a high-level conference on Eliminating Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by UN and NGO Personnel held on 4 December 2006 in New York. It was an occasion for senior leaders of the United Nations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and international organizations to take stock of current achievements and challenges faced in preventing and responding to sexual exploitation and abuse by their personnel and to chart the way forward. The main goals of the conference were: to raise awareness amongst the leadership of both UN and NGO entities on their role in preventing and responding to sexual exploitation and abuse by their personnel; and to agree on a common framework (known as Statement of Commitment) to further advance the standards of conduct outlined in the UN Secretary-General’s Bulletin on sexual exploitation and abuse (ST/SGB/2003/13).

The Statement of Commitment on Eliminating Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by UN and Non-UN Personnel, was endorsed by 21 UN and 24 non-UN entities (including CARE and signed by the then CARE Secretary General) was issued at the conference.
### Annex 3

**PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE (SEA) MEETING AGENDA**

**Overall Objectives:**
- To sharpen the understanding of prevention and response to SEA within an accountability framework
- To address existing gaps in CARE’s prevention and response to SEA
- To establish an Action Plan to implement recommendations for better integration and meaningful application of SEA prevention and response across CARE, internally and in program contexts
- To strengthen staff capacity to implement the Prevention of SEA Action Plan.

#### Day One

**Creating a level playing field**

**Objectives:** To use common language to express shared understanding of key concepts; to build awareness of the internal and external faces of harassment and SEA; to dialogue on the SEA Review findings and recommendations.

**Key Questions:**
- What are sexual harassment, sexual exploitation and sexual abuse? What is SGBV? How do the concepts of power, privilege, discrimination and subordination at the core of our Gender, Equity and Diversity work help our understanding of these issues – internally and in our programming? What policy frameworks guide CARE’s current work in this area? What did we find in the SEA Review? What should be the common policy framework to guide our future work across CARE? International Federation?

**Preliminary Timing:**
- **9am** Welcome - Patrick Solomon
  - Introductions – Amelia Siamomua
  - Meeting Overview – Madhuri Narayanan
- **10am** “What is” Session - Madhuri
- **12:00noon** CARE’s Policy Framework – Madhuri and Joan Connors
- **1:00pm** LUNCH
- **2pm** Beyond Liability to Accountability - Marc Flegenheimer
- **3:45pm** SEA Review Findings and Recommendations – Joan
- **5:30pm** Close

#### Day Two

**Applying Learnings from the SEA Review and the Field**

**Objectives:** To review and apply the learnings of the SEA Review to a proposed common policy and compliance mechanism; to dialogue on application of the learnings in additional focus areas.

**Key Questions:**
- What can we learn from field experiences? Do the SEA Review recommendations fill the gaps? How else might we fill the gaps in these focus areas: HR, Emergency, and Programs? What are the key gaps? What are possible ways forward?

**Preliminary Timing:**
- **9am** Recap of Day 1 and introduction to Day 2 (Volunteers)
- **9:30am** Plenary sharing of Country Office Experiences
- **12 noon** Lunch
- **1pm** Small group work on focus areas
- **4pm** Small group reports to plenary
- **5:30pm** Close
**Day Three**  
*Ensuring Implementation*

**Objectives:** To consolidate the work of Day 2; to establish an Action Plan with special attention to practical, implementable recommendations for taking forward the work to prevent and respond to SEA.

**Key Questions:**
Given our understanding of the SEA Review findings and our activities during Days 1 and 2, what action steps must we take to build a safer CARE and to improve the impact of CARE’s work to build a safer organization and prevent SEA and contribute to addressing the underlying causes of poverty.

**Preliminary Timing:**
- **9am** Recap of Day 2 and introduction to Day 3 (Volunteers)
- **10:15am** Monitoring and Impact Measurements
- **11:30am** Implementation Plans for Recommendations of Review
- **1pm** Lunch
- **2pm** Group Work on Monitoring and Impact Measurements & Implementation Plans for HR and Program including Emergency
- **4pm** Bringing it together
- **5pm** Close

---

**Day Four**  
*Looking Forward*

**Objectives:** To sharpen plan of action for implementation of recommendations and common policy and approach to prevention of SEA.
To link the prevention of SEA work to other key initiatives in programming and in the promotion of gender equity and diversity in the organization.

**Key Question:**
What are the key priorities to be implemented for promotion of Gender Equity and Diversity in CARE? What are the new implications for SEA Advisory Group? What are the next steps to advance the PSEA commitment across the CARE International Federation?

**Preliminary Timing:**
- **9am** Recap of Day 3 and introduction to Day 4 (Volunteers)
- **9:30am** Review and refinements of Action Plan
- **12 noon** Lunch
- **1pm** Small group work on SEA Advisory Group and CI follow-up
- **3pm** Update on GED
- **4pm** Close
IASC Core Principles and Statement of Commitment signed by CARE International

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six (6) core principles to be incorporated into codes of conduct and staff rules and regulations (IASC Draft Protocol March 2004)</th>
<th>Statement of Commitment on Eliminating Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by UN and non-UN Personnel (December 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sexual exploitation and abuse by humanitarian workers constitute acts of gross misconduct and are therefore grounds for termination of employment;</td>
<td>1. Develop organisation-specific strategies to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sexual activity with children (persons under the age of 18) is prohibited regardless of the age of majority or age of consent locally. Mistaken belief in the age of a child is not a defence;</td>
<td>2. Incorporate our standards on sexual exploitation and abuse in induction materials and training courses for our personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exchange of money, employment, goods, or services for sex, including sexual favours or other forms of humiliating, degrading or exploitative behaviour is prohibited. This includes exchange of assistance that is due to beneficiaries.</td>
<td>3. Prevent perpetrators of sexual exploitation and abuse from being (re-)hired or (re-)deployed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sexual relationships between humanitarian workers and beneficiaries are strongly discouraged since they are based on inherently unequal power dynamics. Such relationships undermine the credibility and integrity of humanitarian aid work.</td>
<td>4. Ensure that complaint mechanisms for reporting sexual exploitation and abuse are accessible and that focal points for receiving complaints understand how to discharge their duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Where a humanitarian worker develops concerns or suspicions regarding sexual abuse or exploitation by a fellow worker, whether in the same agency or not, s/he must report such concerns via established agency reporting mechanisms.</td>
<td>5. Take appropriate action to the best of our abilities to protect persons from retaliation where allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse are reported involving our personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Humanitarian workers agencies are obliged to create and maintain an environment which prevents sexual exploitation and abuse and promotes the implementation of their code of conduct. Managers at all levels have particular responsibilities to support and develop systems which maintain this environment.</td>
<td>6. Investigate allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse in a timely and professional manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Take swift and appropriate action against personnel who commit sexual exploitation and abuse.</td>
<td>7. Take swift and appropriate action against personnel who commit sexual exploitation and abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provide basic emergency assistance to complainants of sexual exploitation and abuse.</td>
<td>8. Provide basic emergency assistance to complainants of sexual exploitation and abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Regularly inform our personnel and communities on measures taken to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse.</td>
<td>9. Regularly inform our personnel and communities on measures taken to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Engage the support of communities and governments to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse by our personnel.</td>
<td>10. Engage the support of communities and governments to prevent and respond to sexual exploitation and abuse by our personnel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 5

### Comparison of Incorporation of IASC Core Principles in CARE Lead Member Policies and Codes of Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SGB definitions</th>
<th>Prohibit SEA</th>
<th>Define SEA as gross misconduct</th>
<th>Prohibit SA with child</th>
<th>Allow SA with child if married</th>
<th>Prohibit exchange of money, employment, goods, services for sex</th>
<th>Strongly discourage sexual relationship with bene</th>
<th>Duty to report</th>
<th>All staff create &amp; maintain SEA-free emt</th>
<th>Mgrs have special respons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-Aus</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Ok if law or custom of own or host country permit</td>
<td>Prohibits &quot;exploitative RS&quot;</td>
<td>If victim is a child</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-Canada</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No mention</td>
<td>No mention</td>
<td>Prohibited if &quot;working directly&quot; with community</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-USA</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Implicit, prohibits exploitation broadly</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>Prohibits sexual &quot;RS&quot;</td>
<td>No mention</td>
<td>Prohibits any exchange for aid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>No mention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

**CARE-Australia**
- Workplace Code of Conduct, Code of Conduct for the Protection of the Child and Community Partners, Child Protection Policy. Encompasses “private activities of an employee where such activity may bring discredit upon” CARE-Australia in a broad range of relationships. Standards apply to staff, contractors, volunteers, board members and partners.
- Sexual activity with child permitted when staff “in accordance with laws and customs of their country of origin and/or host country, may have a consensual relationship and/or be married to someone under 18.” International staff are cautioned not to “take advantage of local customs.”
- Staff who consider themselves to be in a “non-exploitative and consensual” relationship with a member of a community CARE-Aus works with directly are directed to disclose the relationship to the staff member’s “supervisor for appropriate guidance.”
- Under Child Protection Policy, must report “any allegation, belief or suspicion of sexual or physical abuse,” past or present, of a child. No mention of reporting in other policies or codes.

**CARE-Canada**
- CARE-Canada Policy and Procedures on Discrimination, Harassment and Exploitation, Standards of Accountability to Community and Beneficiaries for all Humanitarian and Development Workers “within scope of CARE’s employment.”
- “Should somehow such a situation develop, the CARE employee is expected to make this relationship known to their supervisor who will determine if an alternative suitable work arrangement can be found.”
- Duty to report arises when staff member “believes” a violation has occurred, observes or receives information about a violation.

**CARE-USA**
- CARE-USA Code of Conduct, Global Policy Against Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Harassment, Code of Conduct and Accountability to Program Participant Communities Regarding Harassment and Exploitation “within scope of CARE’s employment.”
- Reprisal or retaliation for reporting, providing information or assisting investigation also defined as gross misconduct.
- “Should somehow a romantic relationship develop, the CARE employee is expected to make this relationship known to their supervisor, who will them determine if the current work arrangement is appropriate.”
- Duty to report arises when staff member “believes” a violation has occurred, observes or receives information about a violation.
- Code 6.1.20 expressly prohibits communication of all but limited employment data in reference. This prevents information sharing about SEA-related concerns and is therefore contrary to the Statement of Commitment.

**Generally**
No coherence in applicability of member policies and codes, eg, some apply to personnel, interns and contractors, others also apply to partners and board members.
Scenarios used for clarifying definitions

1. A young girl in your program area is raped by the son of a powerful man in the village when she is returning home after collecting water.
2. One of the women participants in a CARE program is beaten up by her husband regularly.
3. While on field visits, an Assistant Country Director asks women field staff to come to his hotel room after dinner for discussions while he enjoys his evening drinks and shares some jokes with sexual content.
4. The CEO of a partner NGO includes only names of those women who are “nice” to him to go for CARE sponsored cross visits outside their district.
5. The husband of a female staff reporting to you in CARE complains that his wife throws whatever she can lay her hands on (like flower vase, utensils) at him after arguments about her coming home late, not taking care of children, etc. He said yesterday, it was really bad and he had to get some stitches on his head.
6. A taxi driver working for the Taxi company contracted by CARE to pick up women staff from the Airport makes comments with sexual innuendo – “I am really good in bed and we can have as much fun as you do when you go on these over night trips.”
7. A CARE construction supervisor in-charge of building shelters in the rehabilitation program promises to build Mary’s house first if she allows him take photographs of her naked. Mary gives in to his demand as she thinks she has no choice.
8. A village leader appointed by CARE to a monitoring committee to draw up the list of beneficiaries for a CARE supported project includes the name of a widow in the list only when she sleeps with him.
9. A local bank official sanctions bigger loans with faster processing to women’s credit groups formed with support from CARE if women representatives send their young daughters to work at his home.
10. The senior guard at the refugee center run by CARE stares at the breasts of young refugees and passes sexually explicit comments when they come into the center for meeting the counselors.

Scenarios used for clarifying standards

Read the scenarios below and answer the following questions in your group:
- What standards apply?
- What gaps exist, if any?
- How would you fill the gap, if at all?

1. Carlos is a CARE finance officer. He helped to set up a boys’ football club in town. Carlos enjoys the football games, but he seems to particularly enjoy being with local teenagers. He gives gifts (magazines, candy, sodas and pens) to many boys. You have heard rumours that he offers these gifts in exchange for sexual acts. However when you ask around, you are told that the boys in the club are always fabricating stories like this. The HR/admin manager who told you about the rumours said he finds them hard to believe as last summer he and Carlos attended a meeting together in Thailand. While in Bangkok he and Carlos visited a brothel together.

2. Joey is a 19 year old locally hired driver for CARE. He transports relief items from the warehouse to the refugee camp where the items are distributed. On one of his trips he recognized a 17 year old refugee girl walking on the side of the road and gave her a ride back to the camp. Since then, to impress her, he frequently offers to drive her wherever she is going and sometimes gives her small items from the relief packages in his truck, which he thinks she and her family could use. The last time he drove her home she asked him to come inside her home to meet her family. The family was pleased that she had made friends with a NGO worker. Joey really likes the girl; he wants to start a romantic relationship with her and to ask her parents
permission to marry her. He knows her family will approve. The local age of consent is 16 years old and Joey is from the same ethnic group as the girl.

3. As you were leaving a local market recently you observed CARE’s most senior national staff member make an obscene gesture and heard the demeaning comments he directed at the beggars waiting outside the marketplace. This morning on your way to work you passed his home. You heard him yell roughly then heard a woman’s voice howl with pain.

4. Darlene is an international staff member. She is always on the lookout for good business opportunities since she has a family to support back home. She has been asked by a local colleague, Stanislaus, to contribute some money towards renovating a bar in town, in return for a portion of the bar’s profits. Darlene soon finds she is getting a steady income from the bar, and gives more money to hire more staff, including security. She does not go to the bar, but knows that there is a lot of prostitution going on there and that peacekeepers, NGO and UN staff use the bar often. However, she doesn’t think that concerns her since she is not directly involved in those issues. She’s just glad the bar is bringing in extra money that she can send home.

5. The Country Director invites all staff to meet at a local rasta bar with nice gardens – great place for an afternoon. Old camping vans tucked away in secluded spots can be rented by the hour! Dancing later with pretty young girls abounding. A fun and lively place to hang out. Food is not what you go there for!

6. Project participants tell a trusted CARE project officer that another project participant seduced a UNHCR staff member and got him to arrange a favourable recommendation on her resettlement application. The project officer tells her supervisor who in turn tells the CD. The CD remarks that she can’t go telling UNHCR’s Country Rep about every little rumor. These things are very delicate, you know, and what proof is there? In any event, the CD says, community members are always complaining. Just imagine what they tell UNHCR about us!

7. A local government official compiles beneficiary lists for the emergency disaster relief program CARE implements in partnership with the UN. The local official tells program eligible women and girls in the community, mainly widows and adolescent girls heading families, that they will have to give him what he wants to get on the list. The local official wears a CARE t-shirt and cap and is always on hand when relief items are distributed. He is not a CARE staff member although the women and girls, along with other community members, think he is.

8. CARE hires sex workers as peer educators to do HIV-prevention among those in their community who service the truck drivers who pass through a distant part of the country. It is difficult to recruit and retain project staff in this remote area, and unheard of for local women to work with prostitutes. For these reasons, men are hired locally to work on the project. While some of the project staff are committed to empowering the peer educators, others tell crude sexual jokes and pressure the peer educators for special deals on sex. Because the site is remote and travel difficult, country office staff visit the field office at most twice a year. On the most recent visit they observed a great deal of sexual joking between project staff and peer educators and saw one peer educator flinch reflexively as if to avoid a blow when one of the project staff approached her. Country office staff also noted that the field office remained open long after usual working hours.
SEA Consolidated Implementation Plan
Attached as a separate document