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Part One

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On the 24th May 2018, the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) appointed The Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine (‘the VIFM’) to conduct an Independent Review to Improve Practice and Response of ACFID Members in the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct (‘The Review’). The work is being undertaken in two phases.

This Interim Report reports on Phase 1 of the Review. It sets out the context and background, summarises what has been learned so far, including early observations and emerging themes around sexual misconduct in the aid sector. It concludes with a summary of the work that will be undertaken in Phase 2. It should be noted that the Interim Report is based on global scans and research and international and national stakeholder consultations. Primary research data collection and analysis of Australian NGO capacities and performance in relation to the prevention, identification and response to sexual misconduct will be undertaken in Phase 2. This will inform the findings and recommendations in the Final Report which will be made public, and findings will be presented to the ACFID National Conference at the end of October 2018.

1.1 Why have a review?

Forms of sexual violence in the global aid sector have been openly reported since 2002, and in recent years, other aspects of sexual violence in the sector have become evident, including violence against aid workers. Over the last year worldwide recognition of the prevalence of sexual harassment and violence in general society has been reinforced through the “#MeToo” movement. This social media and mainstream media focus is credited with triggering global action and increased reporting, particularly in the media, politics and entertainment industries, before flowing on to the aid sector.

In the early 2000s the sector responded with wide-ranging commitments, policies and procedures to protect vulnerable people, and children in particular, from sexual violence, including the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Task Force on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Humanitarian Crises and initiatives such as the Humanitarian Accountability Project and more recently the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) Alliance.

These efforts were important steps, but in February this year, reports of sexual misconduct by staff employed by Oxfam-GB in Haiti in 2011 and Oxfam’s allegedly weak response drew widespread condemnation. Subsequent reports of harassment within Save the Children-UK raised concerns as to what extent cultural and governance factors may enable sexual misconduct within the sector. These events have prompted a range of actions by governments, peak bodies and organisations to improve prevention measures and response to sexual exploitation and abuse of vulnerable people and aid workers in the international aid sector.

---

4 The “#metoo” movement refers to the global social-media galvanised movement against sexual harassment that was reignited in October 2017 following misconduct allegations against Harvey Weinstein.
sector. We note that the UK International Development Committee published the results of its Inquiry into Sexual exploitation in the aid sector on the 31st July 2018.9

As the peak body for Australian development and humanitarian non-government organisations (NGOs), ACFID wanted to ensure that its members are as equipped as possible to prevent, identify and respond to sexual misconduct both within their organisations and in their international development and humanitarian work. To that end, ACFID commissioned an independent review to assess ACFID member capacities and practices in relation to sexual exploitation and abuse and to identify areas of improvement that are consistent with international best practice and emerging system-wide efforts to reduce sexual misconduct in the sector.

The VIFM was appointed to undertake the Review in late May this year. The VIFM offers a deep understanding of the nature and implications of sexual misconduct on individuals and organisations. The Institute has experience in working with victims of sexual violence and with organisations and institutions to prevent sexual misconduct. The VIFM has high-level research and analysis expertise in this field and familiarity with humanitarian aid work environments and related challenges faced by ACFID member organisations. This unique combination of medical, legal, organisational, research and international deployment expertise and experience is ideally suited to the task of this Review.

1.2 What we have done: Phase 1
We have undertaken a thorough assessment of the international and national environment including stakeholder consultations with key agencies and individuals. This assessment has been aimed at gaining a contemporary and sound understanding of the current and emerging factors and issues with respect to sexual misconduct in the international aid sector.

To identify current best practice with respect to improving, preventing and responding to sexual misconduct in the aid sector, we have conducted a literature review of national and international research publications, industry and government reports, media reports and the content of relevant social media channels.

This work has informed the design and development of a variety of primary qualitative and quantitative research methods and frameworks in order to gain a sound understanding of the practices and views of ACFID members in Phase 2 of the Review.

The VIFM has worked closely with ACFID and its Review Reference Group to design and develop these methods including the accompanying support structures such as a reporting phone line and email address, privacy confidentiality and disclosure policies and an ethical framework.

1.3 What we have found
From the literature review and consultations conducted so far, a number of key themes have emerged that we will test further in the next stage of the review.

Emerging Themes
- Adopting and adhering to victim-centric donor and regulator safeguarding policies and processes is part of successful approaches to safeguarding in aid organisations.

- Where existing child protection frameworks have been tested as robust, this creates an opportunity to build on this capacity to address safeguarding for adults.

---

The need to recognise the translation of internal organisational behaviours to program cultures and practices and the related continuum of behaviours that move from gender attitudes and sexual harassment to sexual exploitation, abuse and violence.

Processes to readily identify perpetrators (groups or individuals) are vital to prevent further exploitation for example, to prevent re-employment in the sector.

Strong leadership is required from aid organisations, donors and regulators for the development and support of a strong reporting culture in the aid sector.

Australian Context
The Review has noted an active focus by key Australian agencies including ACFID as the peak body, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) as the major government donor and policy maker and the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC) as a key regulator, on the need to support and ensure sound safeguarding practices by Australian development and humanitarian NGOs.

Our overarching impression is that there is no evidence that Australia has more problems with sexual misconduct than any other country. In some areas it seems that Australia has a number of specific strengths in safeguarding in comparison to other countries.

ACFID
The ACFID Code of Conduct (CC) and allied Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) provide robust frameworks and indicators to support and assess member organisation good practice across a wide range of measures including finance, resource management, rights such as child protection, gender and disability inclusion, collaboration and governance. All members of ACFID are signatories to the Code and as such are expected to adhere to its principles and obligations. ACFID has commissioned a separate external Review of the Code of Conduct in relation to the prevention of sexual misconduct and the results of that review will be considered in this Review’s final report.

Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
The Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trades (DFAT) child protection policy is internationally respected in the aid sector and many of the Review’s contributors have commented on its strength in comparison to the responses of other donors and governments. Many DFAT-funded organisations now have significant experience in the development and implementation of the child protection policy at program and field work levels, including the requirement that partner organisations also adopt and meet the requirements. This creates an ideal platform for the addition of broader sexual misconduct protections and reporting requirements for adults and vulnerable adults in particular. DFAT has recently undertaken an internal review into sexual misconduct policies and requirements for programs and for internal operations.

Regulation: Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC)
Traditionally regulators such as the ACNC have not differentiated between domestic charities and those operating in the international aid sector. This has changed with the understanding that charities operating internationally more difficult to monitor and face greater risks in the nature of their aid and humanitarian response work. The Department of Treasury is developing new External Conduct Standards for Australian charities. Compliance with these standards will be a requirement for charities with overseas operations.
**1.4 Where we are going next**

In Phase 2 Australian-based primary research will be undertaken with ACFID member organisations using the consultation methods developed and refined in Phase 1. Best practice research and stakeholder consultation at a national and global level will be continued in Phase 2. This will monitor important issues in sexual exploitation and abuse and in particular, multilateral efforts to improve sexual misconduct prevention in the international aid sector. Data from these sources will be reviewed and analysed as a basis for recommendations for ACFID to enhance sexual misconduct prevention for member organisations.

A final report which will be made public and findings will be presented to the ACFID National Conference at the end of October 2018.

---

### Use of language in the Interim Report

For the purpose of this report the following choices have been made in relation to language:

- **On the basis that those experiencing violence may have differing preferences in the language that is used to describe their experiences, we will from here on use the terminology of victim/survivors as used by the Centre Against Sexual Assault.**

- **Defining sexual violence in both social and legal terms is difficult given international jurisdictional differences. For the purposes of the Review we will use the term ‘sexual misconduct’ as an all-encompassing term used to include exploitation and abuse, child sexual abuse and exploitation, sexual harassment and any other form of sexual violence. However, where specific literature, documents or participants refer to a subset of these terms, the term from the original source will be used to avoid confusion with other terms where that is not the intent of the source.**

- **Referring to ‘safeguarding’ and ‘safeguarding policies’ as being measures related to the protection of vulnerable people including children, which may include child protection, complaints handling, whistleblowing, anti-bullying and harassment policies and a staff code of conduct.**

- **Acknowledging that individuals in communities receiving aid may have differing preferences in the language that is used to describe them. We have taken advice from ACFID and will refer to these individuals as ‘beneficiaries’.**

- **The Review notes that the “aid sector” comprises a wide range of actors including governmental, non-governmental, international organisations, other donors, private companies and private citizens. Whilst acknowledging the interrelatedness of many issues in the sector, when the reviewers detail matters pertaining to the “sector”, they will specify the particular context where possible and ask the reader to remain mindful of limitations of generalisability to the ACFID members on whose practice and response the Review focuses.**

---

Part Two

WHY WE ARE HERE
2. WHY WE ARE HERE

2.1 The task

What we have been asked to do
The Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) is the peak body for Australian non-governmental organisations involved in international development and humanitarian action. ACFID unites 122 organisations to strengthen their collective impact against poverty.\(^\text{11}\)

On the 24\(^{\text{th}}\) May 2018, ACFID announced that its Board had commissioned the Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine (‘the VIFM’) to conduct an independent review of ACFID members’ current understanding and application of global best practice in the identification, response and prevention of sexual misconduct.\(^\text{12}\) ACFID developed comprehensive terms of reference for the Review requiring an assessment of the robustness of ACFID’s current system and the identification of new or improved approaches and practices. The delivery of the Review is managed through ACFID’s internal taskforce and the ACFID Review Reference Group.

The Review aims to identify issues and make recommendations that will provide a roadmap for the Australian sector to drive lasting improvements and change in relation to any problems that may have been identified. For the purposes of the Review sexual misconduct includes situations typically referred to by the characterisations of exploitation and abuse, child sexual abuse and exploitation and sexual harassment.

Guiding principles
As reviewers the VIFM is guided by the following principles:

- We are victim/survivor-centric:
  We will listen to the interests of victims and survivors of sexual misconduct through their proxies and advocates; listen to victim/survivors who approach us of their own volition whilst seeking not to retraumatise victim/survivors through formal methods that involve unsolicited approaches.

- We are ethically-grounded:
  We believe in our ethical obligations in our services and research and are guided by principles of respect for individuals, beneficence, research integrity and justice. The consideration of human rights is in the forefront of our research and thinking.

- We are inquisitorial and diligent:
  We are curious and consultative and engage in an open approach to finding views of the community. We are evidence-based, thorough and driven to produce quality outputs.


Independent review

Approach to the review

Our approach to the review entails

- Review of best practice (Phase 1)
  
  We have undertaken a desk-top review of international sector-wide initiatives and new innovations to understand best practice with regard to policy, processes and laws designed to prevent sexual misconduct.

- Structured data collection tools (Phase 2)
  
  We will obtain qualitative and quantitative data regarding the Australian aid sector on individual, organisational and sector-wide considerations through structured data collection tools.

- Consultation with sector members and stakeholders (Phases 1 & 2)
  
  We are examining relevant organisational processes and policies and obtaining the views and experiences of individual professionals through consultation with sector members and stakeholders.

This Interim Report:

- Focuses on issues and observations identified through initial consultations and research.
- Highlights key findings and topics for exploration.
- Outlines the next steps in the Review.

2.2 The need for a review

Sexual violence is widely recognised as a common occurrence. It comprises a range of behaviours that include unwanted sexual comments (including coercion), unwanted touching, aggressive sexual behaviour (including threats), indecent assault, attempted sexual assault, sexual assault and rape. In a World Health Organization (WHO) multi-country study, 6-59% of women reported having experienced sexual violence by a partner in their lifetime, and 0.3-12% of women reported having been forced to engage in sexual intercourse or activity by a non-partner since the age of 15 years. In Australia alone data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics’ (ABS) 2016 Personal Safety Survey reported that 1.7 million (18% or 1 in 5) women and 428,800 (4.7% or 1 in 20) men had experienced sexual violence since 15 years of age. Despite being recorded as a common phenomenon, published statistics are likely to significantly underestimate the true scale of the problem.

Violence against women is a significant global major public health, economic and human rights problem of great concern at an individual, organisational, community, government and country level. Violence against women costs Australia an estimated $21.7 billion a year,

---

attributable primarily to pain, suffering and premature mortality (48%), followed by health, administration and social welfare costs (38%). If no further preventative action is taken, this figure is projected to reach $323.4 billion by 2045.

Forms of sexual violence in the global aid sector have been openly reported since 2002. The sector has responded with wide-ranging commitments, policies and procedures to protect vulnerable people, and children in particular, from sexual violence, including the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Task Force on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Humanitarian Crises and initiatives such as the Humanitarian Accountability Project and more recently the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) Alliance.

In recent years, other aspects of sexual violence in the international aid sector have become evident. These include violence perpetrated against aid workers as well as violence previously documented as being perpetrated by aid workers against beneficiaries. Over the last year worldwide recognition of the prevalence of sexual harassment and violence has been reinforced through the #MeToo movement credited with triggering global action and increased reporting, particularly in media, politics and entertainment industries before flowing on to the aid sector.

In February this year, reports of sexual misconduct by staff employed by Oxfam-GB in Haiti in 2011 and Oxfam’s subsequent response drew widespread condemnation with regard to exploitation and abuse within the sector. Subsequent reports of harassment within Save the Children-UK raised concerns as to what extent cultural and governance factors may enable sexual misconduct within the sector. These events have prompted a range of actions by governments, peak bodies and organisations in the sector to improve prevention measures and response to sexual exploitation and abuse of vulnerable people and aid workers.

2.3 Report by the UK International Development Committee on Sexual exploitation in the aid sector

We have read with interest the report by the UK International Development Committee (UK IDC) on Sexual Exploitation in the Aid Sector. The UK IDC is responsible for holding the UK Department for International Development (DFID) to account for the effectiveness of its

---


28 The “#meToo” movement refers to the global social-media galvanised movement against sexual harassment that was reignited in October 2017 following misconduct allegations against Harvey Weinstein.


spending, administration and policies. The report is primarily focused on safeguarding by organisations receiving UK aid funding. We note the report's key points, namely that:

- Sexual exploitation and abuse is endemic across aid organisations, beneficiary countries and institutions;
- There has been a collective failure of leadership and engagement with these issues from top levels down over many years;
- The aid sector's response to tackling known problems of sexual exploitation and abuse has been reactive, episodic and concerned with reputational management;
- There has been a failure to put victims at the heart of policy-making and active solutions rendering the reforms ineffective and potentially harmful;
- Donors must provide funds to support the implementation of reporting mechanisms

The UK IDC report was published on the 31st July 2018 as this Interim Report was in its final stages of completion. For this reason, there is no reference to the final IDC report elsewhere within the main body of this Report. However, the evidence submitted to the IDC has formed part of our literature review undertaken as part of Phase 1 of our review, and is directly referenced in our discussion in relation to the following parts of this Report:

- Victim/survivors: who are they and how many are there and complexities & risk factors
- Perpetrators: who are they?
- Sector-wide factors: Risks and prioritisation & inter-jurisdictional considerations

We consider the IDC Report to be very thorough and based on a wide range and extensive body of evidence that was presented to the Committee. This evidence has also informed the design of the tools we will be using in Phase 2 of our review to assess the extent to which the same issues are relevant to ACFID members. We look forward to presenting the findings from Phase 2 at the end of October 2018.

Some stark facts from the global context

40 per cent of women and girls surveyed in Syria had experienced sexual violence when accessing services and aid.  

Perpetrators of sexual violence are less likely to go to jail or prison than other criminals.

86 per cent of aid workers know an aid worker survivor of sexual violence.

#AidToo has over 1.1 million impressions on Twitter as of 16th July 2018.

Approximately 30% of organisations receiving funding from the Department for International Development were not able to give assurances as to having a whistleblower policy in place.

---
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3. WHAT WE HAVE DONE

3.1 Consultation: Phase 1

Receptive community consultation

As an initial priority for Phase 1, we established mechanisms to provide support to members of the aid sector who have been affected by sexual misconduct, should they wish to seek it. This enabled people potentially affected to seek crisis counselling and offered them an opportunity to exercise agency by reporting experiences and opinions into the Review. These support mechanisms were made available to both victim/survivors and witness/bystanders. The VIFM review team engaged in a partnership with 1800-RESPECT, the national sexual assault, domestic and family violence support service to further strengthen support options for those who wished to seek psychological help and counselling.

The Review welcomes reports from individuals affected by sexual misconduct as victim/survivors or witness/bystanders into the Review.

This can include confidential communication from individuals whose behaviour other people may have seen to be problematic.

We established a special reporting line, 1800-00-PSEA, for people wishing to report their experiences or opinions into the Review.

The phone line is staffed by senior medical staff with training as forensic physicians and the information is gathered according to a semi-structured script using active listening principles. The information gathered is treated as confidential in accordance with privacy standards agreed for the review and all callers are advised of their rights to privacy and any disclosure principles before any information is collected.

Anyone who calls the reporting line and seek counselling support can opt to be connected to 1800-RESPECT from the 1800-00-PSEA37 line. An email address, psea.review@vifm.org has been established and is available for people who prefer to use this mechanism for communicating experiences and opinions into the Review. To date, five members of the aid sector have emailed the Review to share their stories or opinions. To date, there have been no telephone conversations.

It is difficult to draw inferences from the level of experiential reporting to date and this may rise over the life of the review as awareness of the available reporting procedures grows in the sector. The lack of direct reporting is consistent with the literature reviewed in Phase 1, which indicated that individuals affected by misconduct in the aid sector prefer to report to trusted individuals rather than through hotlines.38 It must also be recognised that there are potentially inherent barriers to reporting sexual misconduct in the Australian aid sector that are similar to other public and private sector organisations where fear of retribution, guilt or concern about privacy can be significant impediments. Given there is no precedent for this style of reporting in the sector prior to this Review, it may be that there are similar perceived risks in reporting into any review such as this. The VIFM and ACFID are actively working to

37 PSEA, referring to the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse, is used in the email and telephone line as a recognised industry acronym and concept. However, for the purposes of this Review, sexual misconduct is used in preference, to incorporate sexual exploitation and abuse but also other behaviours such as harassment that may not be considered part SEA otherwise.

engage the community so that reporting into the Review is known about, easy, ethically sound and of value to the individual.

We continue to welcome the experiences and opinions of members of the aid sector into both the telephone line (1800-00-PSEA) and email address (psea.review@vifm.org) until the end of September 2018.

**Proactive stakeholder consultation: Phase 1**

Consulting with sector stakeholders from governmental, inter-governmental and civil society has been and will continue during both phases of the review. This consultation is being undertaken to identify informal factors such as social norms and attitudes, as well as formal frameworks, policies and processes.

Key stakeholders were identified through the Terms of Reference for the Review. These include the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), the Australian Federal Police (AFP) and the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC).

Other sectoral stakeholders were identified by their relevance and expertise as they pertained to the Terms of Reference. These included individuals with recognised expertise and experience in the sector as well as national and international representatives of lead agencies and organisations. Stakeholder consultations were structured according to the areas in which their interests and expertise intersected with the Terms of Reference.

Stakeholder consultations have occurred face-to-face in London with the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), Bond-UK and other individuals, in Canberra with DFAT, and in Melbourne with the ACNC and with individuals.

Where face to face consultation has not been possible, we have used internet communications technology (Skype platform) to interact with representatives of the Core Humanitarian Standard Alliance (CHS Alliance), Report the Abuse, HearTheirCries, Free to Be (Plan) and other groups and individuals.

Consultation with the ACFID Review Reference Group has occurred face-to-face in Canberra and via the ACFID Review Taskforce by email and tele-conference. Stakeholder consultation will continue until the end of September 2018.

**3.2 Desk-top research of best practice: Phase 1**

We have made a purposeful selection of relevant white and grey literature following a systematic search to undertake desk-top research designed to assess the global context and identify best practice approaches to the detection, reporting, investigation, outcomes and prevention of sexual misconduct in the aid sector. This desk-top research commenced at the launch of the review and will continue into Phase 2.

Four key information sources are being used:

- electronic databases of scientific research literature;
- reports publicly available or provided by organisations;
- electronic database of newspaper articles; and
- social media channels.
3.3 Finalised methods for seeking input from ACFID members in Phase 2

The Review relies on the cooperation and contribution ACFID members whose operational experience and expertise plays a critical role in informing the review. In phase 1 the Review Team developed primary data collection methods and frameworks for seeking input from ACFID member organisations which will inform the final report. We acknowledge the current and future commitment of ACFID members who continue to actively assist the review process.

For primary qualitative and quantitative data collection from ACFID Members in Phase 2 of the review a ‘mixed methods’ approach has been developed. Data from both individual and organisational perspectives will be collected, analysed and cross referenced to gain an in-depth understanding of the issues the review seeks to address. Each of the methods for deployment in Phase 2 is outlined below.

Reported incidents tool

A reported incidents tool (RIT) has been designed to collect focused qualitative and quantitative data with regard to the frequency and nature of incidents of sexual misconduct formally reported to individual ACFID member organisations. This survey tool has been formally provided to the Chief Executive Officers (CEO) of all ACFID member organisations. The data collection period will close mid-August 2018.

Online survey

The online survey has been designed to identify and examine relevant governance structures and policy frameworks in ACFID organisations. The survey was sent to the CEOs of all ACFID member organisations, (separately from the RIT) in mid-July with a data collection period that continues until mid-August 2018.

Interviews

Interviews with a representative sample of ACFID members will gather qualitative data, at individual and organisational levels on formal and informal processes for preventing and responding to sexual misconduct. This includes feedback on access to safeguarding systems and resources and support for complainants. ‘Deep-dive’ interviews across different roles within representative sub-group of member organisations will allow for detailed understanding of internal processes. Approximately forty interviews will be conducted, face-to-face or via the Zoom platform in August and September 2018.

Focus group discussions

Two focus group discussions will obtain broad qualitative data at sector and sub-sector levels including opinions on matters that are informal and intangible. The aim of the discussions is to identify system-wide issues both at a sector and societal level. The focus groups will cover topics such as social norms and attitudes, sector-wide cultures, organisational cultures, operationalising safeguarding policies and issue identification. The focus group discussions will be conducted in Sydney and Melbourne in August 2018.

Field data collection

ACFID has commissioned us to undertake a field trip to Fiji in order to obtain in-country context data for a broad range of considerations including; field capacities; management systems; cultural-interaction; program delivery; social norms and downstream partners. This field data collection is scheduled for the end of August.
3.4 Ethical research framework and privacy considerations

Research framework and key principles

The Research for Development Impact (RDI) Network, in partnership with ACFID, has developed principles and guidelines for NGOs conducting research and evaluations that fall outside formal ethics approval processes. These principles are: respect for human beings; beneficence; research merit; and integrity and justice.

The VIFM reviewers and the ACFID Taskforce have formally mapped each stage of the review process, from the commissioning of the review, through each methodological stage and the later implementation of findings against these principles.

Informed consent

The Review adheres to the principle that valid consent is voluntary, informed and freely given and the right of the individual to give valid consent before participating in this Review.

Participants in the formal methods, namely the online survey, interviews and focus groups are ACFID member representatives who are consulted during their working day and are therefore likely to have met the competency or capacity requirements of being over 18 years of age and not under the influence of drugs or alcohol or impaired by cognitive, intellectual or psychiatric complaints. If there is concern that they do not meet the competency or capacity requirements, then they may be excluded.

Participants in these formal methods are provided with a formal explanatory document setting out the consent principles being adhered to. Consent is then implied through active participation.

Privacy & confidentiality

As reviewers we are highly sensitive to the privacy and confidentiality considerations (ethical, professional and legal) that are pertinent to investigations into matters of sexual misconduct. We are committed to protecting the privacy of participants, as far as is legally and ethically possible, in the way information is obtained and handled. In this context we have a professional, legal and ethical duty to balance respect for privacy with the well-being of individuals and the public interest, so there may be circumstances where there is an obligation to disclose information to police or other authorities. These obligations have been described in detail to participants and form part of the informed consent process.

Information handling practices for the review are consistent with the Commonwealth Privacy Act 1988, the Privacy and Data Protection Act 2014 and the relevant standards issued by the Office of the Victorian Information Commissioner. The VIFM will store data for five years, in line with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research issued by the National Health and Medical Research Council.

Please see the Appendices to this Interim Report for further details on the ethical framework and related privacy, confidentiality and disclosure considerations for each of the primary research methods, tools and support documentation that have been finalised for deployment in Phase 2.
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Part Four

WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED TO DATE
4: WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED ABOUT THE GLOBAL CONTEXT

In Phase 1 we have gathered information about the global context of sexual misconduct in the development and humanitarian response sector through a variety of methods including desk top research and direct consultation with key bodies and individuals in Australia, the UK and elsewhere. This has included gathering information about existing and emerging responses to improve sexual misconduct prevention, identification and response. Some of this material, for instance, that which relates to the behaviour of UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (UNDPKO), is beyond the remit of this Review. However it is important context for understanding the impact of sexual misconduct on individuals and communities and the reputational consequences of these behaviours.

In Phase 2 we will move from the broad to the particular. Work in Phase 1 has informed the design of research approaches, surveys, interview questions, field trip design and focus groups for gathering detailed data about Australian organisational internal and program capacities and practices for preventing sexual misconduct. Through this process we have identified global factors, patterns and proposed innovations that we will test with Australian responders. The final report will provide detailed information on ACFID member capacities and practices and recommendations for improvement which take account of the global nature of the work of these Australian-based organisations.

4.1 Victim/survivors

Who are they and how many are there?

Men can be victims of sexual misconduct, but sexual violence is predominantly perpetrated by men against women and children.41-42 Other known factors that increase the risk of being a victim of sexual misconduct include being gay or bisexual,43 having a disability, and being economically, socially or intellectually disadvantaged.

It is not possible to know precisely how many victim/survivors there are due to under-reporting in the communities affected by misconduct and variations in definitions of what constitutes sexual misconduct.44 However existing reports indicate that sexual misconduct in the sector is widespread45 46 47 48 49 50 (We note that some of this data is based on a broad

interpretation of the ‘sector’ which covers UN agencies, including UNDPKO, government agencies and NGOs of all sizes engaging in disaster response, refugee crisis support and development work.)

**Complexities and risk factors**

We know that sexual violence is common in all societies. Risks of sexual violence may be higher in the aid sector because of the nature of the work, which:

- entails frequent staff rotations,
- involves activities in regions with poor institutional support from police and the judicial systems for crimes of sexual violence
- requires multiple partnerships with down-stream partners
- includes proximity to large populations of economically disadvantaged people. (Poverty is an acknowledged risk factor for sexual exploitation.)
- can be undertaken in regions where societal norms favour women’s inferiority and sexual submissiveness.

The environmental factors also contribute as they:

- may involve areas of active civil or state-based hostilities
- may include states of emergency, crisis or disaster
- may be under-resourced
- may be adversely affected by geographic or weather phenomena
- are often remote from an organisation’s head office
- may include jurisdictional legal boundary differences.

The power relationship between the victim/survivor and the perpetrator may affect the level of risk and type of violence that may occur and that which may be reported. There is an inherent power relationship between aid workers and beneficiaries. Possible additional manifestations may include that:

- beneficiaries are more at risk of exploitation from someone who has control over resources.
- aid workers may be more at risk of harassment if they are female, young and early in their career and women of colour.51

These factors will be explored further in Phase 2.

**Why is victim/survivors reporting so limited?**

“We should never underreport cases of sexual exploitation or abuse. It is extremely likely that sexual exploitation and abuse will be prevalent in the places in which we work.”

DFID Official

Reporting is thought to be a difficult decision for victim/survivors of sexual misconduct who may conclude that that they have more to lose than gain if they report the conduct. Concerns around losing their livelihood, damaging theirs or their organisation’s reputation, losing their dignity (or those of the community they serve) and in some cases, the threat to


their or their loved one’s lives have been described as directly affecting the decision to report their (or others’) experience of sexual misconduct.  

Furthermore, the prospect of a desirable outcome may not be high, be that an investigation, a procedural outcome or a justice outcome. The aftermath of reporting including the stress associated with being involved in subsequent processes may be demanding and re-traumatising.

It should also be recognised that in some circumstances, victim/survivors may not identify the behaviour as criminal due to the endemic nature of the abuse, the jurisdictional legal issues including policing and judicial system or the attitudes to gender crime or social norms.

The methods to be employed in Phase 2 of the Review will be exploring these factors in more detail.

What is important to victim/survivors?

We have heard from review participants that it is of utmost importance to strengthen the response to sexual misconduct, including the support provided to victim/survivors. This mirrors contemporary research, literature and best practice where a robust response to reporting of sexual misconduct must meet the needs of the victim so that they:

- feel physically and psychologically safe
- are listened to, valued and believed
- have access to counselling advocacy support
- have swift and competent investigative processes
- see tangible benefits which may include putting a stop to the violence, seeking health, social, or justice outcomes, financial reparation, job security
- are not punished for reporting and or seeking help.

4.2 Perpetrators

Who are they?

Sexual misconduct encompasses a wide range of behaviours, and for this reason there will be heterogeneity amongst perpetrators. Most perpetrators are male. The typology of adult male rapists includes groups that include the “compensatory” (expression of sexual fantasies with minimal aggression), “sadistic” (expression of aggressive sexual fantasies), “anger” (expression of rage), “power/control” (desire to achieve power and dominance) and “opportunistic” (spur of the moment, impulsive, situational).  

Adult male child molesters can be classified as those who perpetrate preferentially and those who perpetrate situationally although these can be considered as a continuum. According to the UK National Crime
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Agency three per cent of males in the UK may have a sexual attraction to children.\textsuperscript{58} The majority of these men will not act on these impulses and not all these men will have a primary attraction to children.

Approximately 5% of sexual abusers of children are women.\textsuperscript{59} There is less known about the typology of female sexual offenders.\textsuperscript{60}

A model of exploitation in sport stratifies the risk of abuse as being a factor of three variables, namely the abuser inclination, the situational opportunity and the child vulnerability.\textsuperscript{61}

The aid sector, especially in-country where there may be large vulnerable populations, can be an environment that facilitates opportunistic behaviours.\textsuperscript{62}

Drugs or alcohol may be used to facilitate sexual misconduct.\textsuperscript{63}

Early stakeholder consultations and reported evidence\textsuperscript{64} suggests most perpetrators of sexual exploitation and abuse are aid workers who are nationals of the host country. It is unclear whether this reflects the larger population of aid workers who are local nationals or whether this represents a higher proportion of offending or reporting in this group. However some have reported that expatriate men in senior positions who have been in the organisation for a long time may be amongst the worst perpetrators.\textsuperscript{65}

A recent report on sexual exploitation in the international aid sector identifies “harmful masculinities” that play out in three archetypes; namely ‘cowboys’ (younger opportunistic perpetrators), ‘conquering kings’ (older enabling perpetrators) and ‘headquarters privileged man’ (the senior manager).\textsuperscript{67}

Many cross-jurisdictional responses to sexual misconduct in the aid sector currently under development are focused on the thorny problem of developing international processes to improve the identification and tracking of perpetrators and to ban them from aid-related work. The final report for this review will address this in more detail.


\textsuperscript{59} Mallett X. (2017) Women also sexually abuse children but their reasons often differ from men’s. https://theconversation.com/women-also-sexually-abuse-children-but-their-reasons-often-differ-from-mens-72572

\textsuperscript{60} Blasko, B., (2016). Overview of Sexual Offender typologies, Recidivism, and Treatment in E.L. Jeglic and C. Calkins (eds), Sexual Violence (pp 11-29). Huntsville: Springer International Publishing


Sexual Misconduct – includes any of the following.68

Sexual Exploitation – 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.

Sexual Abuse – Actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, whether by force or under unequal or coercive conditions. This includes against a child.

Sexual Harassment – Sexual harassment refers to prohibited conduct in the work context and can be committed against staff and related personnel. In context of the Humanitarian Aid Organisations, sexual harassment primarily describes prohibited behaviour against another Humanitarian Aid Organisation staff member or related personnel, which may also include nationals of the host state. It 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. This includes sexual harassment that conducted online or via social media.

Sexual harassment is not sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) within the definition although sexual harassment behaviours are part of a spectrum of behaviour with SEA.

Sexual Violence – Includes, at least, rape/attempted rape, sexual abuse and sexual exploitation. Sexual violence is ‘any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic a person’s sexuality, using coercion, threats of harm or physical force, by any person regardless or relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work.’ Sexual violence takes many forms, including rape, sexual slavery and/or trafficking, forced pregnancy, sexual harassment, sexual exploitation and/or abuse, and forced abortion.

The following list of acts constitute sexual violence:
- Unwanted sexual comments
- Unwanted sexual touching
- Aggressive sexual behaviour
- Attempted sexual assault
- Sexual assault
- Rape

Why do they offend?
Sexual violence is often driven by inequalities in power. Perpetrators can be motivated by a need or sense of entitlement to control and dominate their victim rather than by sexual desire.
Subscription to traditional gender and social norms emphasising male superiority is associated with higher rates of sexual violence perpetration by men.

The global social awakening of sexual harassment in the #MeToo movement has contextualised reports of sexual exploitation more squarely in a gender paradigm and has given more focus to harassment as a precursor or indicator of sexual exploitation and abuse. These issues will be explored further during Phase 2 of our review process.

The Cowboys and Conquering Kings report authors have written an open letter which was signed by 1538 women aid workers explicitly calling for CEOs, senior managers and boards to “shift the patriarchal bias in aid” which they characterise as a “culture of silence, intimidation and abuse”. Requested reforms include effective safeguarding leadership, commitment to action and access to resources. Discussion on these two pieces of work and other related matters is facilitated on social platforms such as Twitter under the hashtag #AidToo and particularly the hashtags #AidOpenLetter and #ReformAid which focus on the role of patriarchy in driving problem sexual behaviour.

### The spectrum of behaviours

This Review considers harassment and abuse as a spectrum of behaviours. We are learning that this view is shared by others; harassment and abuse are now openly seen within a single paradigm within wider public discourse and in the context of this review, albeit on a spectrum of violence that may have common or indeed interlinked causative factors.

“DFID consider that sexual harassment could be an enabling factor for sexual exploitation and abuse”

DFID official

However, some members of the sector who have contributed to the review have expressed concerns about all forms of sexual violence being considered together, fearing conflation between sexual offences that might be considered “more serious” (for example child rape) with those considered “more minor” (for example harassment of competent adults) might shift the emphasis from the needs of the most vulnerable people. They have also indicated that conflation between the two ends of the spectrum of behaviour might alienate those men who are fighting patriarchal culture they have been brought up with.

We are learning that members of the sector have concerns that consensual sexual relationships, including those that may be transactional, will be stigmatised.

We are learning that there is not necessarily a common understanding of the manifestations of behaviours that are considered harmful including the differentiating between work and leisure behaviours. An internal review of an ACFID member organisation provided confidentially to the VIFM also uncovered challenges in interpreting and defining unacceptable behaviours in different cultural contexts.

### How are perpetrators able to offend?

We discovered in a review of the literature, supported by the stakeholders we have spoken to so far that perpetrators may be able to continue offending, often due to a lack of accountability and inadequate investigative processes. Police, particularly those in nations experiencing conflict or disasters may not have investigative processes or capabilities to
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undertake effective criminal investigations into complaints regarding such behaviours. In addition, judicial systems may be overstretched or inaccessible to sections of the community. In the context of the UN, immunity given to workers perpetuates a cycle, perhaps even a culture of impunity. For organisations undertaking internal non-criminal investigations, the adoption of the criminal standard of proof “beyond reasonable doubt”, together with a lack of investigative expertise, makes it difficult to prove allegations in a way that permits the organisation to hold perpetrators to account and prevent them re-offending.\textsuperscript{72}

Some organisations have internal human resource management and privacy and confidentiality obligations to individual employees that enable suspected or known perpetrators to move between organisations in the sector relatively easily, without being held to account.

### 4.3 Sector-wide factors in sexual misconduct

The following section explores some of the themes that have emerged from our early consultations in terms of factors that may contribute to sexual misconduct. Some of these observations relate to the global aid sector; Phase 2 of the review will test their applicability to the Australian context.

#### Reputational risk and transparency

Aid organisations are inherently dependent on community, government and philanthropic donations and grants and are therefore highly vulnerable to reputational damage.

We are learning that there may be inherent disincentives for organisations to be fully transparent due to the existential harm associated with reputational damage perceived to be associated with an increase in reporting.\textsuperscript{73}

These risks extend to the whole sector, beyond aid organisations themselves.

\begin{quote}
\textbf{“These are risk issues that can affect the quality of Australia’s aid program and our national reputation in this field”}

Senior DFAT official
\end{quote}

It is important to make a distinction between public transparency and transparency with donors. Australian aid organisations regularly report child protection breaches to DFAT, as required. As these reports are not made public, the reputational risk in reporting is more limited (though not absent). It should be noted that these breaches can be related to downstream partners, sub-contractors or other organisations. The Oxfam scandal highlights the importance of this distinction; it became public, in part, because of a lack of transparency in reporting to a donor.

Organisations whose incidents have been most widely reported are not necessarily those considered to be most at risk of these incidents occurring. In fact, several participants observed that there may be a “tall poppy” element at play where sector-leaders are more subject to criticism on the very safeguarding issues in which they lead.

\textsuperscript{72} Professor David Ranson, BMedSci BM BS LLB FRCPath FRCPA FACLM FFILM FFCFM DMJ(Path) Deputy Director, VIFM. Consultation 12 July, 2018.

Risks and Prioritisation

We are learning that an organisation’s response to sexual misconduct may be related to how it is framed as a risk. Organisations may have risk maturity/risk tolerance discordance and continue to “fire-fight” rather than “fire-control” integrity risk.

Factors that affect the framing of sexual misconduct as a reputational risk include considerations such as how closely sexual misconduct, and sexual exploitation and abuse in particular, is associated with the organisation’s core work (for example, child protection organisations). External drivers that affect the framing of risk include the socio-political environment. The current #AidToo environment is probably the most obvious example of how reputational risk has reframed sexual misconduct.

Humanitarian ethics have been intrinsically rooted in a rights-based approach since the Second World War. The Humanitarian Imperative stipulates that “human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found”. According to the Sphere Humanitarian Charter, “nothing should override this principle”. We are learning that this has the potential to lead to reprioritisation of other risks, including sexual misconduct, “for the good of the mission”.

We are learning that preventing and responding to sexual misconduct requires the allocation of financial resources and that this can be seen as an ‘overhead’ that can impact on the ability to achieve program outputs.

Leadership and governance

Contributions to the Review have emphasised that there are cultural and commercial drivers within certain organisations that may be associated with harmful behaviours.

International organisations often operate with devolved models of governance, in which the particular, rather than the whole, informs decision making and strategy.

Activating policies at the enterprise level would appear to be crucial to effective implementation. The embedding and bringing to life of policies allows these to self-replicate and become woven into the fabric of the organisation.

In Australia, according to the ACFID State of the Sector Report, amongst ACFID members, men outnumber women in senior management and organisation leadership roles and whilst the gender balance of organisation boards is close to parity, board chairs are mostly men. However a recent study has also found that NFP Directors are more engaged in culture in 2018 than in the previous years.

Inter-jurisdictional considerations

We are learning that there are significant technical difficulties in coordinating responses to misconduct across the aid sector within different legal jurisdictions. In matters such as perpetrator registration and screening, including that for criminal records, it is difficult to coordinate privacy legislation across different jurisdictions.

Aid organisations have specific internal regulations and standards that transect national boundaries. However, these organisations operate in politically unstable and conflict contexts in nations with inadequate justice and health systems. By the nature of their work, many NGOs also work with particularly vulnerable populations. Other challenges can include
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prevailing social and cultural practices and accepted workplace behaviours. In some jurisdictions sexual misconduct is a low priority in the face of other overwhelming health care and social needs.

There can be complex ethical and procedural challenges in managing sexual misconduct in some national jurisdictions where criminal codes may not even cover the offence. In some nations or regions it may be known that if a victim reports to local authorities, the personal consequences for that individual might be horrific, including scenarios of victim blaming and consequent “official” punishment.

In the wake of the Haiti scandal there have been multiple calls for a dedicated regulator for the aid sector. According to one of our contributors “mandatory external review, accountability with financial sanctions” is the only way to tackle organisational incentives to under-report abuse.

A working group of representatives from seventeen governments is collaborating on strategies to address particular inter-jurisdictional considerations.

4.4 The Australian context

The following section explores some of the learnings that have emerged from our consultations with stakeholders in the Australian context.

ACFID Code of Conduct

The ACFID Code of Conduct is a voluntary, self-regulatory sector code of good practice. Its purpose is to improve international development and humanitarian action outcomes and increase stakeholder trust by enhancing the transparency, accountability and effectiveness of ACFID members. The Code was developed in 1997 and has undergone several revisions since then. The Code is governed through the Code of Conduct Committee which is an independent, voluntary body which monitors adherence and investigates complaints.

All members of ACFID are signatories to the Code and as such are expected to adhere to its principles and obligations. In managing the Code ACFID balances the opportunity to learn, with providing external assurance. It facilitates learning through a triennial self-assessment, the provision of a Good Practice toolkit, tailored advice and support to members including training. ACFID provides assurance to external stakeholders by reviewing annual Code self-assessments, verifying compliance with selected aspects, overseeing an independent complaint handling process, reporting on Code compliance to stakeholders and conducting spot checks.

The Code is currently undergoing a separate review by another external body. This process will assess Code compliance, the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) and the adequacy of the Code and the QAF in addressing sexual misconduct issues.

The ACFID Code references the international Core Humanitarian Standard which provides alignment in the global aid sector.

Observations relating to the Code of Conduct

The QAF is very robust and in particular addresses financial risk and responsibilities in fine grained detail. However increased awareness of the prevalence of sexual exploitation and
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abuse in international development and humanitarian responses indicates a need to assess
the adequacy of existing good practice indicators that support prevention and detection of
sexual misconduct at a governance level. Governance responsibilities and capacities for
gender and safeguarding for adults could be strengthened in the Code’s QAF to enhance
links with operational responsibilities. The addition of a requirement for incident reports
statistics in the ACFID Code assessment process would provide useful data for monitoring
prevalence and complaints handling processes.

There are some early indications of a need to develop a more nuanced sexual misconduct
complaints-handling processes that can respond to sometimes complex circumstances that
can prevail. This is consistent with a global need to improve sexual misconduct complaints
handling in the aid sector identified by other contributors. ACFID has potential to play a
central role in assisting member organisations to improve this particular aspect of sexual
misconduct response.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Over the past decade, the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) has led the field
in embedding its Child Protection Policy\(^{80}\) in international operations and humanitarian and
development work. The child protection policy applies to all organisations that receive DFAT
funding and contains obligations for downstream partners. The policy requires that all cases
of confirmed or suspected child exploitation, abuse or policy non-compliance are reported to
DFAT.

The DFAT policy is internationally respected in the sector and many of the Review’s
contributors have commented on its strength in comparison to the responses of other donors
and governments. It would seem to offer an ideal platform for the addition of broader sexual
misconduct protections and reporting requirements for adults and vulnerable adults in
particular. Many DFAT-funded organisations have significant experience in the development
and implementation of the child protection policy at program and field work levels, including
the requirement that partner organisations also adopt and meet the requirements.

It appears that sexual exploitation and abuse of adults is not as mature or fully ingrained
within the risk management as child protection is.

Expertise and experience in operationalising this policy across complex domains means that
Australian organisations are well placed to build on this and establish broader safeguarding
policies. DFAT’s allied program policies which require recipient organisations to consider
gender equity and disability in program design also support the eventual development of
more specific sexual misconduct framework requirements

DFAT’s Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) provides an opportunity for Australian
aid organisations to access Australian Government funding to support agreed development
initiatives. In 2017-18 the ANCP received $128.8 million to support 57 Australian NGOs to
deliver 455 projects across 57 countries\(^{81}\). In order to benefit from this funding NGOs must
undertake a rigorous accreditation assessment to demonstrate that they have the
governance, management capacity, including risk management, and systems, policies and
processes required to meet DFAT’s due diligence requirements.

According to a senior DFAT official “We recommend the allocation of budget for child
protection in program design, so organisations can meet DFAT’s Child Protection Policy
requirements. Organisations are looked at as a whole. We try hard to not be prescriptive and
welcome different approaches and ideas. We do not mandate, risk-based approval allows for
pragmatic approaches. We need to know that organisations have planned for and can


Regulators, including the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC) have traditionally regulated aid organisations in a similar way to domestic charities. It is now understood that charities operating internationally are at once more difficult to monitor and at the same time exposed to more risk in terms of the context and the nature of their aid and humanitarian response work.

Regulators have realised that aid organisations have specific regulatory needs. In Australia the ACNC has developed tools to improve the governance of charities that operate internationally. The regulator is also supporting the decision by government to develop new External Conduct Standards. These are currently being drafted by Treasury and there will be consultation on the draft standards shortly. A review of the ACNC legislation was conducted earlier this year as mandated by the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (Consequential and Transitional) Act 2012. The panel’s report has been provided to government and will be tabled in Parliament shortly.

Compliance with these standards will be a requirement for charities with overseas operations. The broad principle-based standards are expected to include obligations to third parties, ensure that money is used for the purpose for which it was intended with a focus on the well-being of beneficiaries.

The ACNC does, however, still rely on voluntary disclosures for reporting sexual misconduct. The ACNC has an educative and collaborative approach to working with the sector that relies on voluntary disclosures for reporting sexual misconduct although the majority of concerns come from the community of staff, volunteers, beneficiaries of charities. Approximately 22% of investigations are initiated by the regulator through data matching.

Our overarching impression is that there is no evidence that Australia has more problems with sexual misconduct than any other country. In some areas it seems that Australia has a number of specific strengths in safeguarding in comparison to other countries.
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5: WHAT WE WILL DO NEXT

What we will seek

In Phase 2 of the review, we will be focussing our attention on gathering more data direct from ACFID member organisations to inform our interim learnings. In accordance with the review’s Terms of Reference we will be seeking to understand and identify:

- existing ACFID member processes in relation to preventing and responding to sexual misconduct.
- gaps in ACFID member safeguarding capability and resourcing.
- victim-centric proactive approaches to justice including complaints and investigations
- strategies to address power and gender imbalance, starting at the top of organisations
- approaches to address the employment cycle of perpetrators, including referencing and registration.
- approaches to integrate policies and make them fully operational
- ways to redress disincentives to reporting, transparency and accountability in ways that are truly effective but do not jeopardise programmes.

How we will seek it

By asking

In surveys, interviews, focus groups and on the field trip the Review will ask individuals for their opinions and ideas.

By listening

The Review will listen to people who wish to share their experiences and opinions by telephone on 1800-00-PSEA (business hours EST) or send an email to psea.review@vifm.org until the end of September 2018. We welcome the views of victim/survivors and witness/bystanders, including men.

By looking

The Review will undertake further best practice research and monitor multi-lateral government and aid organisation committee work in this field. We will continue a comprehensive systematic review of the best evidence that is available.

By examining

The Review will analyse the quantitative and qualitative data from all the formal collection tools to form opinions.

How we will share it

The Final Report to this Review will be made public, and findings will be presented to the ACFID National Conference at the end of October 2018.
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## Appendix A: Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFID</td>
<td>Australian Council for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACNC</td>
<td>Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP</td>
<td>Australian Federal Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCP</td>
<td>Australian NGO Cooperation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
<td>Centre Against Sexual Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Code of Conduct Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>Core Humanitarian Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Child Sexual Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAT</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Interagency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>International Development Committee (of the UK Parliament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>International Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFP</td>
<td>Not-for-Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEA</td>
<td>Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEAH</td>
<td>Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAF</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDI</td>
<td>Research for Development Impact Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIT</td>
<td>Reported Incidents Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Sexual Exploitation and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Sexual Misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDPKO</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIFM</td>
<td>Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Ethics, Privacy and Disclosures

Ethical Framework

Principle and summary of key points

1. Respect for human beings
   - Autonomy, dignity, rights, privacy of individuals
   - Respect for diversity and cultural values
   - Commitment to participant welfare over research goals
   - Informed consent and the right to withdraw
2. Beneficence
   - Value of the research to the community it is conducted upon
   - Informing participants of benefits and risks of participation/research itself
   - Do no harm responsibility to both participants and researchers
3. Research merit and integrity
   - Team conducting research have relevant experience and expertise (including of pertinent cultural and social norms)
   - Appropriate and rigorous methodology
   - Findings are presented fairly, openly and without deference to vested interests
4. Justice
   - Fairness in process for determining who participates in the research, including consideration of barriers to participation for different groups
   - Consideration of the burden of research on participants
   - Making findings available to participants in a timely and accessible manner
SAMPLE: EXPLANATORY STATEMENT: INTERVIEWS

Project

Chief Investigators
Dr Maaike Moller, Dr Elizabeth Manning and Dr Lyndal Bugeja
Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine
Phone: +61 3 96844 444
Email: psea.review@vifm.org

We would like to invite your participation in the Review. Please read this Explanatory Statement in full before deciding whether or not to participate in this project. If you would like further information regarding any aspect of this project, you are encouraged to contact the Chief Investigators via the phone number or email address listed above.

What does the research involve?
The overall aim is to review practice and response of ACFID members in the prevention of sexual misconduct. While the interviewer will ask for information about your organisation and your experiences, you will remain anonymous. The interview will take an estimated 45 minutes to complete.

Why were you chosen for this research?
A sub-group of ACFID member organisations which reflect the overall membership composition has been selected for additional interactive participation in the Review process.

Consenting to participate in the project and withdrawing from the project
Participation in the interview is completely voluntary and you will remain anonymous but please note that you must be 18 years old or older to participate. The Chief Investigators will ensure that interview–based data is de-identified and cannot be traced back to a certain participant. Therefore, it will not be possible to withdraw data once you have submitted your responses. We do not require you to complete a consent form; if you choose to participate in the interview then consent will be implied.

Results
Results from this project will be presented in a de-identified and aggregate format and provided as a report to ACFID. The final report will be publicly available. Data will be kept on VIFM premises, on password protected computers, for five years whereupon the data will be destroyed.

Complaints
Should you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of the project you are welcome to contact: complaints@vifm.org

If you have read the above information, please proceed with the interview.
Privacy Statement in relation to
Review to improve practice and response of ACFID members in the prevention of sexual misconduct.

Who are we? Why are we collecting information?

The Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) has engaged the Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine (VIFM) as an independent reviewer to understand the practice of ACFID member organisations in preventing and responding to allegations of sexual misconduct amongst their employees and agents, and to make recommendations to address any areas needing improvement. The VIFM is a statutory agency providing expert forensic medical services to the justice system in Victoria, Australia. We have experience in working with organisations to prevent sexual misconduct, high level research and analysis expertise in this field. We also undertake training and forensic medical activities internationally and are familiar with the nature of humanitarian aid work environments and the challenges faced by ACFID member organisations.

Who does this privacy statement apply to?

This privacy statement applies to all individuals whose personal information we collect during the course of the review. This includes people who participate in focus groups, interviews, surveys and those who may contact us by telephone or email to report matters relevant to the review.

How will we collect, store, use and disclose information?

We understand that information we need to conduct the review may be very sensitive and we are committed to protecting your privacy, as far as is legally and ethically possible, in the way we handle any information that you provide to us. When we conduct surveys, interviews and focus groups we are unable to collect information anonymously. If you call to speak to us, you can choose to remain anonymous. Once collected we will store and use all information in a de-identified way and only for the purposes of the review. We will employ data coding methods so that only our review team will be able to link information to its source. This also means we will not be providing identifying information to ACFID, and your information will not be identifiable in our review report, not only in terms of your name, but also any other features that may identify you, including role, place or date of incident. We will use password protected data storage tools to ensure that only our review team has access to the stored information.

These information handling practices are consistent with the Commonwealth Privacy Act 1988 and other legal standards in relation to maintaining confidentiality, which include storage of documents for five years following the review.

Are there any exceptions to the way we say we will use and disclose your information?

We have a legal and ethical duty to balance our respect for privacy with the well-being of individuals and the public interest, so there may be circumstances where we may be obliged to disclose information to police or other authorities. These circumstances are explained in more detail below:

With regard to children

During the course of collecting information for the review we may form a reasonable view that a child (a person who has not yet reached 18 years of age) in Australia is in need of protection from significant harm as a result of physical injury or sexual abuse. If the child’s parents have not protected or are unlikely to protect the child from harm of that type we will be obliged to report the matter to the child protection authorities and police in the relevant state, in accordance with our obligations under mandatory reporting legislation.
In relation to children outside Australia, we are obliged to act on risks of abuse to comply with international codes and legislation outlawing sex tourism and other exploitation. How we act will depend on the nature of the circumstances including any risks associated with reporting. (This may include any serious risks to the life or well-being of the alleged perpetrator, for example through vigilantism.) **The well-being of the child or children will be paramount.** This relates both to any identified children and to unidentified children in the wider community.

If we receive reports that raise child protection issues in Australian aid funded projects, we will be obliged to report these issues to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). Where we receive reports about child protection issues unrelated to Australian aid funded projects we are not obliged to report to DFAT. However, where appropriate we will advise those reporting child protection issues to pass this information to the relevant project donors and local authorities.

**With regard to adults**

We respect the rights of autonomous adults to make decisions with regard to reporting offences committed against them.

Where a legally competent adult does not want to report an offence committed against them, we will respect this wish. However, in a rare circumstance there may be a serious risk to a person’s life, health, safety or welfare or a serious threat to public health, public safety or public welfare by not disclosing information. If such a rare circumstance were to arise VIFM may report the offence to police or other authorities. This would happen in a way that was respectful of the persons’ wishes after discussion by a panel of VIFM practitioners, convened for the purposes of advising on medico-legal issues arising in the course of this project.

Where an adult against whom an offence may have been committed is not legally competent or it is not possible to determine their wishes, we will act according to their best interests and those of the wider community, including any other vulnerable adults at ongoing risk. (This may include any risks to the alleged perpetrator.) Our actions will depend on the nature of the circumstances, including any risks associated with reporting.

If we receive reports that raise protection issues for vulnerable adults and beneficiaries we are not legally obliged to report to DFAT regardless of whether they involve projects receiving Australian aid funding. However, where appropriate we will advise those reporting protection issues for vulnerable adults to pass this information to the relevant project donors.

**With regard to both adults and children**

If we form the view that an Australian national is an alleged perpetrator in a case where reporting is required then the matter may be reported to the AFP. If we receive reports were there is no information regarding the nationality of the alleged perpetrator then there will be no obligation to report the matter to the AFP although it may be prudent to do so in order to facilitate liaison with INTERPOL.

In all cases where we receive reports that we determine require further action based on the criteria above, if the incident involves an organisation that is an ACFID member, we will advise the organisation and we will advise ACFID. If the relevant organisation is not known we will not be in a position to advise the relevant organisation, although it is possible that they may become aware through other reporting mechanisms outlined above.
In general terms

- All reports will be discussed by a panel of VIFM practitioners, convened for the purposes of advising on medico-legal issues arising in the course of this project.
- Any information disclosed will be the minimum required and to the fewest parties in accordance with our ethical and legal obligations.

If we do not have sufficient information to determine whether or not the wellbeing of children or adults is at risk, then we have no basis on which to report to police or other authorities.

Please also refer to the attached flow charts

How you can contact us

If you have any questions or concerns about your privacy, or you want to provide information for the review you can contact us by telephone on 1800 00 PSEA during business hours (9am-5pm Mon-Fri) or by email to: psea.review@vifm.org. These communications lines will be open until 28 September 2018. If you or someone you know needs crisis counselling please contact tel: 1800RESPECT.

Procedures in relation to disclosures are shown in Figures 2-5 below
Reporting to local authorities (police + child protection) - Child Victims <18

Victims include identified, unidentified, current, potential and historical victims of psychological, physical or sexual harm

Are the child/ren in Australia?

Yes

No

Report to local authorities

Are there risks associated with reporting?

Yes

No

Panel discussion

Report to local authorities

Agree to not report

Agree to Report to local authorities
Reporting to local authorities (police) – Adult Victims/Survivors \( \geq 18 \)

Victims include both identified and potential victims

Is the victim/survivor: **Identified AND Legally Competent?**

**Yes**

Does the victim wish to make a report?

**Yes**

Report to local authorities

**No**

Is reporting in the victim’s best interest?

**Yes**

Report to local authorities

**No**

Panel discussion

Are there any serious associated risks with not reporting?

**Yes**

Panel discussion

**No**

Respect victim’s wishes not to report

Agree to not report

Agree to Report to local authorities
Reporting overseas incidents to AFP

Is the alleged perpetrator Australian?
- Yes
- Not Known
- No

Report to AFP
- No requirement to report to AFP

Reporting to DFAT

Is it a DFAT funded project?
- Yes
- Not Known
- No

Are Child/ren involved?
- No
- Yes

No reporting requirements
Mandatory reporting required
Appendix C: Methods

Best practice Review

Study Design
A review of scientific research literature, reports, newspaper articles and social media will be conducted using systematic methods adapted from the Preferred Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)\(^3\).

Timeframe
Best practice review commenced mid-July 2018 and is expected to be completed mid-August 2018.

Eligibility Criteria
Material will be included in the review where it contains information on best practice approaches to the: i) prevention; ii) identification / detection; iii) reporting; iv) investigation; or v) outcome of incidents of sexual misconduct in the humanitarian and development aid sector.

Information Sources and Search
Four information sources will be used for the review: 1) electronic databases of scientific research literature; 2) reports publicly available or provided by organisations; 3) electronic database of newspaper articles; and 4) social media.

Electronic Databases of Scientific Research Literature
A search of four electronic databases from the disciplines of medicine, nursing and health sciences will be conducted to locate studies from the first available year to the present time. The databases will comprise: Ovid Medline; Ovid EMBASE; Ovid PsycINFO and CINAHL. Two key concepts: 1) “sexual misconduct”; and 2) “humanitarian and development aid” and associated search terms (both indexed and key words) will be used to form a search strategy (for example Table 1).

Table 1: Search terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Misconduct</th>
<th>Humanitarian and Development Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct</td>
<td>Humanitarian aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offence / offending</td>
<td>Development aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>Relief work / workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>Development projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>Development work/workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual exploitation</td>
<td>Emergency relief / response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Disaster response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example search strategy developed from Table 1 and piloted in one of the databases (Ovid Medline) is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Search strategy in Ovid Medline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Search</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(sex* adj1 misconduct).tw.</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(sex* adj1 offen*).tw.</td>
<td>2664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>exp Sex Offenses/</td>
<td>21542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(sex* adj1 abuse*).tw.</td>
<td>10888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RAPE/</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>rape*.tw.</td>
<td>8973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(sex* adj1 harass*).tw.</td>
<td>1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment/</td>
<td>1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Child Abuse, Sexual/</td>
<td>9431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(sex* adj1 assault*).tw.</td>
<td>3819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(sex* adj1 exploit*).tw.</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(humanitarian* adj1 aid).tw.</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>exp Relief Work/</td>
<td>4404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(relief* adj1 work*).tw.</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(crisis adj1 relief).tw.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(crisis adj1 response*).tw.</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(emergency adj1 relief adj1 response*).tw.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(disaster* adj1 response*).tw.</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11</td>
<td>33693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18</td>
<td>5680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19 and 20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reports**
The search engines Google and Google Scholar will used to identify reports on the prevention of and response to sexual misconduct in the humanitarian aid section from 1 January 2002 to the present time. The following phrases will be searched and the first ten pages of results reviewed:

1  "prevent / detect / response / report / investigate / outcome
2  sexual abuse / assault / exploitation / harassment
3  humanitarian aid
4  development aid"

Reports will also be sought from persons the Review Team engage in stakeholder consultation.
**Newspaper Articles**

The electronic database Factiva will be used to identify newspaper articles on the prevention of and response to sexual misconduct in the humanitarian and development aid sections from 1 February 2018 to the present time. The search phrases used for the reports will also be applied to the newspaper articles.

**Social Media**

The social media platform Twitter will be used to identify items (including online news articles, blogs, and videos) pertaining to sexual misconduct in the humanitarian and development aid sectors. The hashtags #AidToo and #ReformAid will be searched and the top 100 Tweets (i.e., the most relevant and popular Tweets, as determined algorithmically by Twitter) from 1 February 2018 to the present time will be reviewed.

Additionally, all Tweets from the Australian Council for International Development (@ACFID), Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (@dfat) and Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (@ACNC_gov_au) containing either of the aforementioned hashtags will be reviewed.

**Selection**

Results from the four sources will be imported into reference management software (Endnote X5). Any duplicates will be removed using a standard function before each entry is screened for eligibility against the criteria outlined above. The full text of material that meets the inclusion criteria will be obtained for data extraction.

**Data Extraction**

Data items of interest will be recorded in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Information of interest will comprise evidence on individual, organisational and system factors shown to:

- reduce the risk of incidents of sexual misconduct in the humanitarian and development aid settings
- maximise detection when incidents of sexual misconduct do occur
- facilitate reporting of incidents involved
- outcomes that hold perpetrators accountable
- outcomes that provide adequate redress and support for victim/survivors

An assessment of the strength of evidence will be based on the type of material. For example, scientific research literature and organisational reports will be considered stronger evidence than newspaper reports or social media.

**Data Analysis**

A synthesis of the data extracted will be conducted of the individual, organisational and system factors for the elements of prevention, detection, reporting, investigation and outcomes. This will identify areas of where there is consensus on best practice, conjecture on best practice or inadequate information on best practice.
Reported incidents tool

Study Design
To quantify the frequency and examine the nature of incidents of sexual misconduct formally reported to ACFID member organisations, a standardised reporting tool was developed (title the Reported Incidents Tool).

Timeframe
The collection period is from mid-July to mid-August 2018.

Sampling Strategy
Purposeful sampling techniques will be applied to include the population of ACFID Member Organisations.

Recruitment Strategy
ACFID will provide the Review Team with the email addresses for the ACFID contact person at each member organisation. The Review Team will contact each member organisation via email to invite their participation. The email will have attached an Explanatory Statement and the Reported Incidents Tool template. The Explanatory Statement will comprise information about the purpose of the project, confidentiality, aggregation of data for analysis and reporting, instructions on data entry into the Reported Incidents Tool and a Data Dictionary to assist with completion.

Instrument
A Reported Incidents Tool instrument was developed by the Review Team in consultation with ACFID, the ACFID Reference Group and following consultation with an ACFID member organisation. The Reported Incidents Tool was created in Microsoft Excel designed as a unit record dataset.

Data Collection and Analysis
The Reported Incidents Tool comprises 30 questions in five sections: Administration; Incident; Reporting; Victim / Survivor(s); Alleged Perpetrator(s); and Investigation. Questions comprise a combination of: structured free text; free text; and categorical.

The analysis conducted by the VIFM Review Team will include:
- the number of alleged incidents of sexual misconduct reported to ACFID member organisations for the calendar years 2015, 2016 and 2017.
- the proportion and type of ACFID member organisations that received reports of sexual misconduct.
- the proportion of alleged incidents of sexual misconduct occurred: in Australia and in overseas fields of operation.
- the proportion of alleged incidents of sexual misconduct occurred: between aid workers; and between aid workers and beneficiaries / individuals in affected populations.
- the number of alleged incidents of sexual misconduct reported to ACFID member organisations that were: substantiated and actioned, unsubstantiated, withdrawn.
- for each group (substantiated, unsubstantiated, withdrawn) what was the age, gender and role profile of the alleged perpetrator and victim/survivor.
- among substantiated incidents of sexual misconduct reported to ACFID member organisations, identify the penalty imposed on the perpetrator(s).
- among substantiated incidents of sexual misconduct reported to ACFID member organisations, identify redress provided to the victim/survivor(s).

Focus Groups

Study Design & Timeframe
Two focus groups will be conducted: one in Melbourne (early August 2018) and one in Sydney (late August 2018).

Sampling & Recruitment Strategy
Purposeful sampling techniques will be applied to ensure that the focus groups include a representative sample of ACFID member organisations. Members of relevant Community of Practice Groups will also be invited to participate in focus groups. A member of the Review Team will contact the organisations via email to invite participation in the focus group. The invitation will be accompanied by an explanatory statement. If the organisation agrees to participate, a participant will be identified and the details of the date and time of the focus group will be provided.

Instrument
A focus group instrument was developed by the Review Team in consultation with ACFID and the ACFID Reference Group.

Data Collection & Analysis
The focus group will be conducted by a facilitator from the Review Team with the assistance of a second member of the Review Team. The facilitator will ask four questions (and additional sub-questions) to the group. Participant responses and discussion will be documented. Discussion on each question will continue until the group feels that all views have been captured.

Where consent is given by all members of the group, the focus group will be audio tape recorded for the purposes of accuracy. Written notes will also be taken. The audio tape recordings will be professionally transcribed into Microsoft Word and checked against written notes taken during the interview. A review of the Microsoft Word processed transcripts will be conducted to remove unnecessary text around or between each question such as unrelated conversation, repeating of questions and general clarification.

An initial detailed reading of all responses to each question will be undertaken to become familiar with the content. During a second reading, categories will be identified, labelled and defined. Upon a third reading, text associated, either illustrating agreement or disagreement, with the categories will be identified. Text will be coded to more than one category or not be coded to any category. This procedure will be repeated across all questions in the focus group to refine categories.
Interviews

Study Design
Structured and semi-structured interviews will be conducted in two phases. Phase 1 will entail multiple interviews for six member organisations and Phase 2 will entail single interviews with representatives from an additional fifteen member organisations.

Timeframe
Interviews will be conducted in August and September 2018

Sampling & Recruitment Strategy
Purposeful sampling techniques will be applied to ensure that interviews reflect a significant and representative group of ACFID member organisations. For Phase 1, two large, two medium and two small ACFID member organisations will have multiple key informant interviews across a range of roles and levels of the organisation (see Table 1). Organisational categorisation as large, medium and small is based on ACFID’s internal criteria. As it may not be possible to interview at each level of the organisation, particularly for medium and small organisation, the focus will be on theme saturation rather than the number of interviews. Theme saturation is usually achievable at between 15 and 20 interviews.

Table 1: Phase 1 sampling strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large ACFID Member Organisation</th>
<th>Medium ACFID Member Organisation</th>
<th>Small ACFID Member Organisation</th>
<th>Total Interview s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Staff</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal Point</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Worker</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Phase 2 interviews will be conducted with an additional 15 organisations which reflect the broader ACFID membership characterises.

A member of the Review Team will contact organisations to invite participation in the interview series. The invitation will be accompanied by an explanatory statement. If the organisation agrees to participate, the Review Team will identify the key informant and develop an interview schedule.

Instrument
An interview instrument was developed by the Review Team in consultation with ACFID, the ACFID Reference Group and following a review of similar instruments.
Data Collection & Analysis

The interviews will be conducted either face-to-face, via video conference or over the telephone by a Review Team member. Where consent is given by the key informant, the interview will be audio tape recorded for the purposes of accuracy. Written notes will also be taken. The audio tape recordings will be professionally transcribed into Microsoft Word and checked against written notes taken during the interview. A review of the Microsoft Word processed transcripts will be conducted to remove unnecessary text around or between each question such as unrelated conversation, repeating of questions and general clarification.

The analysis will examine responses both within and across organisations. An initial detailed reading of all responses to each question will be undertaken to become familiar with the content. During a second reading, categories will be identified, labelled and defined. Upon a third reading, text associated, either illustrating agreement or disagreement, with the categories will be identified. Text will be coded to more than one category or not be coded to any category. This procedure will be repeated across all interview questions to refine categories.

Online semi-structured survey

Study Design

To identify and examine the governance structures and policy frameworks in place across ACFID organizations a structured and semi-structured survey was developed.

Timeframe

The survey collection period is mid-July to mid-August 2018.

Sampling Strategy

Purposeful sampling techniques will be applied to include the population of ACFID member organizations.

Recruitment strategy

Using the contact list provided by ACFID, the Review Team will email each member organisation to invite their participation. The email will have attached an Explanatory Statement and a link to the survey tool. The Explanatory Statement will comprise information about the purpose of the project, confidentiality and aggregation of data for analysis and reporting.

Instrument

The survey instrument was developed by the Review Team in consultation with ACFID and the ACFID Reference Group. The survey was created and disseminated using Qualtrics.

Data Collection & Analysis

The survey comprises 27 questions structured as a combination of free text and categorical variables. A univariate and bivariate descriptive statistical analysis will be conducted of categorical variables and a content analysis will be conducted on free text variables.
Field trip protocol

Study Design
The field trip will provide information relevant to almost all aspects of the Review TOR but particularly those related to sectoral, societal and systemic factors as they pertain to both social norms and attitudes and the ‘coal-face’ operation of policies and processes (including the ACFID Code of Conduct and DFAT Child Protection Policy). In addition, the field trip will address field-specific factors including the complexities entailed in working with partner organisations including NGOs, contractors, volunteers and government agencies. It will address how working with different cultures, in jurisdictions with laws and protections and approaches to work place (and leisure) behaviours that differ from those that prevail in Australia influence response to incidents of sexual misconduct. The field trip will strengthen the Review by facilitating input from aid workers who are directly involved with implementing processes and relevant stakeholders and NGOs that provide support services to victim/survivors. It will also provide an opportunity for direct observation of relevant factors.

Qualitative semi-structured interviews will be used during the field trip with ACFID member organisations and with relevant stakeholders.

Timeframe
The Field Trip will take place at the end of August 2018.

Recruitment & sampling Strategy
For the field trip interviews ACFID member organisations have been selected to reflect a range of ACFID member categories in terms of size, area of expertise and faith-based or secular status. Stakeholder consultation with also be sought with relevant Fiji-based Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) representatives and Australian Federal Police (AFP) members and the Fiji Ministry of Health and/or the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty. Additionally the VIFM Team will meet with NGOs who provide support services for victim/survivors of sexual assault.

Table 1: Field Trip sampling strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiji Field Trip</th>
<th>Large ACFID</th>
<th>Medium ACFID</th>
<th>Small ACFID</th>
<th>Total member Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACFID Member Organisations</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>x 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Stakeholder sampling strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Total Interviews (minimum individuals expected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFAT</td>
<td>x 2 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP</td>
<td>x 1 attendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji Ministry of Health and/or Ministry of Women, Children &amp; Poverty</td>
<td>x 3 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>x 2 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>x 2 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrument
An interview instrument has been developed by the Review Team in consultation with ACFID and the ACFID Reference Group. All interviewees will also be provided with an Interview Explanatory Statement, a copy of the Review Privacy Statement and a copy of the ACFID Review Guide.

Data Collection & Analysis
The interviews will be conducted through face to face meetings in Suva, Fiji over a four day period. Written notes will be taken during the meetings. These will be the basis for a Field Trip Report which will also include analysis of feedback, observations and recommendations.
## Appendix D: Participants to Review to Interim Report Stage

### Table 1. Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet Cousens</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Act for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Watkins</td>
<td>A/g Director Compliance</td>
<td>Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Doyle</td>
<td>Director, Legal and Policy</td>
<td>Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Difford</td>
<td>DGR Project Manager</td>
<td>Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prue Monument</td>
<td>A/g Assistant Commissioner, Charity Services</td>
<td>Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Dunbier</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Director</td>
<td>Australian Civil-Military Centre (ACMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Ridge</td>
<td>Policy and Advocacy Advisor</td>
<td>Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Petre</td>
<td>Chair, Code of Conduct Committee</td>
<td>Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Purcell</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raewyn Lans</td>
<td>Member and Stakeholder Engagement Lead</td>
<td>Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Burrows</td>
<td>Director of Development Effectiveness</td>
<td>Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Watkin</td>
<td>Media and Communications Advisor</td>
<td>Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Kates</td>
<td>Manager, Pacific International Operations</td>
<td>Australian Federal Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wright</td>
<td>Director, Communications and Membership</td>
<td>Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Moyle</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>CARE Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Greenwood</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Spencer</td>
<td>Social Development Adviser, Violence Against Women and Girls</td>
<td>Department for International Development (DFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire James</td>
<td>Humanitarian Adviser</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Brow</td>
<td>A/g Assistant Director, NGO Programs, Performance and Quality, NGOs and Volunteers Branch</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindy Judge</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Child Protection and Compliance Section</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Anderson</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary, NGOs and Volunteers Branch, Humanitarian, NGOs &amp; Partnerships Division</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni Hunt</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Child Protection and Compliance Section</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Finucane</td>
<td>Director, Gender and Inclusion Hub</td>
<td>Finucane Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Evans</td>
<td>Lecturer in the Social Science of Development</td>
<td>Kings College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Macleod</td>
<td>Professor, Founder, Chairman</td>
<td>Kings College London Hear Their Cries Griffin Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Cull</td>
<td>Director, Advocacy and Community Engagement</td>
<td>Plan International Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Nobert</td>
<td>Founder and Former Director</td>
<td>Report the Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asha Bradley</td>
<td>Gender Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Save the Children Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Miller</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>Save the Children Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Fletcher</td>
<td>Co-chair ACFID Sexual Rights In Development Community of Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver May</td>
<td>N/A – Private individual</td>
<td>N/A – Private individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Proud</td>
<td>Public Safety Industry Consultant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (Confidential email contributor #1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous (Confidential email contributor #2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Documentation Reviewed


Australian Council for International Development. (2018). Diagram for interaction between CCC and external review. Privately provided to the VIFM review team by the Australian Council for International Development.


Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2018). Complex administered contract template. Confidentially provided to the VIFM review team by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
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