Mitigating the Risk of Sexual Exploitation & Abuse and Gender-based Violence in World Bank-funded projects in Somalia
Objective

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the risk of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA) and Gender-Based Violence (GBV) in World Bank operations in Somalia, in the context of the recent report on Working Together to Prevent Sexual Exploitation and Abuse: Recommendations for World Bank Investment Projects1. It aims to describe briefly the operating context in Somalia as well as outline practical recommendations for portfolio and project level risk management. It serves as a discussion piece for upcoming consultations for the Country Partnership Framework (CPF) as well as a guide for task teams with active and pipeline projects.

Background

In October 2016, World Bank President Jim Yong Kim established an independent Task Force of external experts to provide guidance on how to strengthen Bank systems, tools and processes to prevent and mitigate against risk of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA), as well as other forms of gender-based violence (GBV), in World Bank-supported infrastructure and other area-based investment projects. The Task Force was created in response to findings emerging from an Inspection Panel investigation of the Uganda Transport Sector Development Project, which found evidence of a range of severe impacts related to sexual misconduct, including with minors, exploitation and abuse and other forms of gender-based violence.

The Task Force released its final report in August 2017 outlining findings and recommendations for how the Bank can do more to prevent or respond to incidence of SEA/GBV. The Task Force recommendations for Bank-supported investment operations highlight the need to:

- prevent SEA of women and children through improved project risk assessment, active community engagement and the design and monitoring of systems to minimize risks;
- strengthen the speed and effectiveness of response should such an incident occur, through well-functioning protocols and remedial actions to enable safe and ethical care of survivors; and
- build the capacity of all actors, the Bank, government, contractors and communities, to take on their respective responsibilities for action, while also working together to protect women, children and other vulnerable groups at risk.

In particular, the Task Force Report highlights the extent to which existing World Bank-supported projects may compound broader contextual risks of GBV in a society, community or relationship that already contribute to prevalence of gender-based violence. These risks may include poverty, gender inequitable norms, policies and laws that discriminate against women and cultural norms that condone or reinforce acceptability of use of violence against women and girls, or use of violence as an acceptable form of conflict resolution or discipline. Project-related risks vary by sector but may include the size and scale of a project, the scale of labor influx, the extent to which a community has capacity to absorb labor influx or requires separate camp facilities, and the geographic location of project activities. Income in the hands of migrant workers can also create or worsen existing power imbalances between workers and members of the community, in particular for women and children. Outside of infrastructure investments, economic empowerment interventions, including cash transfers and other social protection interventions, may increase vulnerability of female participants to violence in the home, while projects involving recruitment or retention of female candidates might exacerbate uneven power dynamics and expose women to potential harassment. Absence of livelihood opportunities can often drive women and girls’ engagement in risky behaviors to secure resources for the home; in some situations this can lead to transactional sex or exchanging sexual favors for goods or economic opportunities.

---

3 Potential contextual and project related risks are outlined in Annexes 2 and 3.
Identifying and understanding project-related risk factors as they interact with other contextual risk factors is critical for development of appropriate prevention and mitigation measures in project design; The Task Force report outlines extensive recommendations in order to do so more effectively, including through enhanced identification and assessment of key risks. The Bank is in process of implementing the recommendations, with key steps outlined in an accompanying Action Plan for Implementation released for key actions to identify, understand and address key risks of sexual exploitation and abuse and other forms of GBV.\(^4\) Task Force recommendations place considerable emphasis on prevention to ensure incidence does not occur in the first place, through strengthening social risk management systems, through improved accountability through World Bank legal agreements and procurement requirements, and through enhanced monitoring, including through Third Party Monitoring where necessary.

**Identifying, Mitigating and Responding to SEA/GBV Risk in the World Bank Portfolio in Somalia**

**Country Context**

Gender-based violence is a significant challenge in Somalia. Drivers of GBV in Somalia include pervasive insecurity, impunity, increased vulnerability and displacement—linked both to conflict and climate-related disasters—and deteriorating social and customary structures. Displaced women and girls are among the most vulnerable populations—to extreme poverty, marginalization and conflict and climate-related shocks. In collaboration with UN partners, the Bank supported conduct of a comprehensive GBV survey undertaken in 14 urban centers across Somalia and Somaliland. This study demonstrates the significant burden of partner and non-partner violence for both women and men across the life course, with 36 percent of women experiencing intimate partner violence (IPV) and 17 percent experiencing non-partner violence (NPV).\(^5\) Key risk factors associated with experiences of violence include internal migration and displacement as linked to conflict or disaster, working outside of the home, poverty and the absence of sufficient resources to meet the basic family needs, lack of education, and witnessing parent/caregiver violence in childhood. Findings further highlight that children are vulnerable to physical and sexual violence in their home, in schools and in public, underscoring intergenerational dimensions of GBV.

Evidence emerging from this survey aligns with data from other sources. Service-based data collected using the GBV Information Management System (GBVIMS)\(^6\) reveals that over 14,000 cases of GBV were reported from January 2015 through June 2016. Of the total number of cases, over 50 percent were cases of physical assault, while incidence of rape and sexual assault ranged from 30-34 percent during this period.

---


\(^5\) UN-WB Somalia GBV Study.
A significant share of these reported cases—roughly 20 percent—had been perpetrated against children under the age of 17 (roughly 12-13 percent between ages 12 and 17 and 7-8 percent from ages 11 and younger). In 2015 alone, child sexual abuse accounted for 16 percent of reported cases. Types of violence captured by the system include physical assault, rape, sexual assault, forced marriage, denial of resources, and psychological/emotional abuse. Persistent violations in Somalia also include intimate partner violence, abduction, forced prostitution, exploitation and human trafficking. Data from the GBVIMS⁶, however, only reflect reported cases to service providers working directly with GBV survivors and therefore likely belie the extent of the challenge as most survivors are unlikely to seek formal support or care due to fear of stigmatization, rejection or re-victimization.

Current conditions linked to the ongoing drought, including the dramatic increase in rates of internal displacement rates compound existing risks, particularly affecting displaced women and children. Between April and June 2017, the Gender-Based Violence Information Management System (GBVIMS) reported a 9 percent increase in reported rates of GBV—including physical and sexual assault, as well as child sexual abuse—between the first and second quarter of 2017. Of these cases, over three-quarters of survivors are IDPs. While early and forced marriage are prevalent features in Somali society, a recent assessment conducted by the Protection Cluster further revealed that 59 per cent of respondents indicated early marriage is more likely in the context of the current drought due to monetary incentives and the assumption that the husband will care for the child bride (United Nations Protection Cluster 2017).

Given the mix of drivers of violence as well as current understanding of prevalence and help-seeking behavior, Somalia is considered high risk for incidence of GBV. Understanding how projects interact with and potentially exacerbate these risks is therefore critical to ensure Bank-supported projects adopt appropriate prevention and mitigation measures during project design and throughout implementation. This is all the more critical as Bank engagement in Somalia expands. The following sections detail key actions to take place at both the portfolio and project levels to address these risks.

**Portfolio-level actions**

**Portfolio risk assessment**

Portfolio-level risk assessment has already begun in Somalia (see annex) based on data and surveys generating primary data and information. This has been supplemented by desk review and ongoing engagement with other partners. As the new CPF period begins, in order to understand better potential risks presented by investments in the Somalia portfolio, a full review of existing and pipeline operations is recommended to be conducted by an experienced GBV specialist with knowledge of and experience in Somalia.

---

⁶ The GBVIMS was established to harmonize data collection on GBV in humanitarian settings to provide a simple system through which associated organizations and agencies can collect, store and analyze data, and also share incidence data in a safe and ethical manner. The system was established and rolled out in Somalia in 2011 and is currently used by 36 organizations in Somaliland, Puntland and Southern and Central Somalia. In reported cases 98 percent were female.
This would involve consultations with several different stakeholders, including government, civil society, UN agencies, local and international NGOs and other international partners. These consultations would help further understand the level of risk exposure by increasing the understanding of prevailing risk conditions. This would include:

- Existence of business norms and codes of conduct in government, private sector, amongst different segments of society and at community level that address sexual harassment and clearly lay out consequences for those who engage in inappropriate behaviour
- Social behaviors and norms influencing discussion, perpetration of acts of violence and treatment of survivors at the community and household levels
- Existence of legal frameworks and capacities governing SEA and GBV
- Understanding help seeking behavior and reporting of different types of GBV in Somalia experienced by women and girls
- Engagement of the wider community of actors in Somalia dealing with SEA and GBV risk – in Somalia this includes the GBV Working Group, including UN agencies such as UNICEF & UNFPA.

Work is already underway at the project level as part of the Somalia Capacity Injection Project and can be extended to include a review of the wider portfolio. Sample Terms of Reference for this work is included in Annex 4. This review may also include recommendations for how to integrate or retrofit key prevention and mitigation to protect against incidence of sexual exploitation and abuse or to enable effective, appropriate response should incidence occur. New projects should undertake risk analysis, building on existing available knowledge on the Somalia context, with consideration with project features. Risk assessment should be conducted both by Bank Teams and by client partners. A Risk Assessment tool to guide Task Teams during project design is has been developed and piloted in select country portfolios in the Africa Region. This tool will be applied to the specific projects within the Somalia portfolio; while the tool is currently adapted for infrastructure projects with civil works components (including e.g. construction, rehabilitation or upgrading), the tool may be adapted and applied to projects in other sectors. Critically, this risk assessment work is not solely the responsibility of the Social Development Specialist affiliated with the Country Team but should be a central consideration of the CMU at portfolio level and the TTL and other members of the Task Team at project level. Again, if needed, a technical specialist should be engaged to support project preparation and design to address risks of SEA/GBV. Additional resources may be made available to high risk projects.

Risk assessment undertaken by the client should be integrated into broader environmental and social impact assessment work as part of standard safeguard requirements. ESIAs should include review of specific GBV-related risks and should further identify mitigation measures to address those risks. Mitigation measures should subsequently be integrated into relevant safeguard instruments (e.g. ESMPs, C-ESMPs).

7 The GBV Global Thematic group has a validated list of GBV consultants that can be used to hire consultants with extensive GBV experience.
**Training for Task Teams and operational staff**
The Country Management Unit will work with the Senior Social Development Specialist to engage all task teams and operational staff working on Somalia in dedicated training. This will equip staff with an understanding of the operational risks (based on the portfolio risk assessment), with the capacities to engage in discussion on SEA and GBV in Somalia and also the means to reflect SEA/GBV risk management in the design of projects. A broader sensitization and awareness training is currently under development by GSURR and the Gender Theme Group and will be rolled in select country offices; Somalia (in partnership with the Kenya country team) will be nominated as a pilot country for preliminary roll out of this training. The training will include a review of the GBV Good Practice Note, which provides concrete guidelines on how to manage GBV risks throughout the project cycle.8

**Discussion with Government and other stakeholders as part of CPF consultations to introduce GBV risk management as a new norm in WB projects**
The consultations for the CPF present a timely opportunity to introduce SEA & GBV risk management into the discussions on norms and expectations governing World Bank-funded projects. The consultations will be used to discuss why this is an important issue for the Work Bank, the expectations of different stakeholders and codes of conduct which will be introduced into the projects. It will also be an opportunity to gauge what further support government counterparts may need to be able to play their part in managing risks related to SEA and GBV. Preliminary discussion with the Minister for Women and Human Rights Development at the federal level is encouraging; the Minister has expressed a strong interest in this work and support for establishment of a government-wide sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse policy and is interested in collaborating with the Bank and any relevant partners to develop this policy.

The consultations will also be an opportunity to start to engage a wider group of stakeholders; civil society organizations, local and international NGOs, media, to start to sensitize them to this agenda.

**Development of database of experts, international and local, who can support operations in Somalia, – training of consultants to ensure WB standards are understood**
Working with GSURR, the CMU will develop a database of SEA/GBV international and local experts who can provide guidance to task teams and operational staff. These experts will be made familiar with the recommendations of the Task Force’s report, as well as new corporate guidelines outlined in the forthcoming GBV Good Practice note, and will be familiar with the operating environment in Somalia. These experts will support teams to conduct risk assessments and develop mitigating strategies as needed.

The CMU will also develop a database of experts who can support the design of grievance readdress mechanism, making use of relevant technologies but more importantly, adapted to the environment in Somalia.

**Community mapping to identify available GBV response services and potential community advocates:**
Project preparation should include mapping of existing service providers for survivors of GBV, both governmental, international agencies and international/local NGO/CBOs. This work should ideally be undertaken at the portfolio-level to provide perspective of available/reliable service providers and potential partners. At the same time, during project preparation there will likely be need for further

---

8 This note has been developed by a GBV resource group comprised of key teams in GSURR, the Gender Theme Group, Transport, OPCS and LEGEN.
mapping within the more specific project area to identify appropriate partners or potential gaps that may need to be filled. This more granular mapping would be conducted by the client, likely during wider social impact assessment activities (with guidance and support from Bank teams or technical experts). Overall mapping activities (at the portfolio level) should seek to identify key services recommended as part of a holistic response to GBV including (as available): psychosocial support, health (with the ability to provide post-exposure prophylactics [PEP] and emergency contraceptives to survivors of sexual violence), legal/police, safe house shelters and livelihood support. The mapping should also make note of existing referral pathways or opportunity to create referral pathways for survivors to facilitate and raise awareness of different services, no matter the entry point to the services. Community mapping activities should also include identification of potential community advocates and allies (e.g. women’s groups or organizations with expertise in working on children’s issues) with focus on GBV in proposed project geographical areas, potential community advocates and allies (e.g. women’s groups or organizations with expertise in working on children’s issues) with focus on GBV in proposed project geographical areas. Mapping of community actors and GBV prevention and response services has currently been integrated into the generic ToRs for the GBV Risk Portfolio Review exercise and can be included as part of that wider exercise. The mapping exercise may be also be used to understand better help-seeking behavior in communities, barriers to access services and quality of services available.

The importance of proximity in managing SEA and GBV risk in highly insecure environments

Experience in managing risk at portfolio level as well as managing risk through project supervision in Somalia has demonstrated that proximity to the client as well as intensive, real-time dialogue with field-level stakeholders plays a crucial role in understanding and managing risk. This is particularly important in the case of Somalia where access is limited and teams rely on information from a number of sources. While access to the client is limited, the proximity of TTLs in Nairobi allows task teams to conduct missions more regularly and in response to emerging issues. This will be particularly important in address SEA/GBV risk. The Task Force Report and Action Plan for implementation both set targets for leveraging innovative communications tools for community dialogue and interaction. Given the extent of internet and phone penetration in Somalia, developing mechanisms for real time information exchange and reporting through ICT presents another opportunity for direct interaction and engagement with project beneficiaries. Piloting of reporting mechanisms and citizen engagement tools in forthcoming projects should therefore be considered. Another critical point of contact on the ground will be any Third Party Monitors engaged by the CMU or if needed by respective projects. Third Party Monitoring has been articulated as a critical measure to ensure proper supervision and monitoring of risks related to SEA/GBV. TPMs may include contracted firms, NGOs operating on the ground or other academic partners. Importantly, TPMs should demonstrate previous experience in working on GBV or should ensure sufficient technical capacity of select staff to undertake work related to GBV. Additionally TPM activities will not monitor incidence of GBV per se, but will be used to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of identified risk prevention and/or mitigation measures.

Monitoring

Ensuring effective implementation of GBV requirements at the portfolio level will require systematic monitoring and assessment to identify potential gaps or challenges and to enable adjustment. The CMU will support periodic monitoring and review of key provisions of the GBV/SEA Risk Mitigation Strategy under the forthcoming CPF, likely every 12 months. Review of GBV/SEA risk mitigation and management efforts should also feature as part of the Country Portfolio Performance Review.
Project Level – recommended actions throughout the project cycle

Prep and design:

Risk assessment at project level – during project design phase, it is recommended that task teams engage an expert who can conduct a risk assessment specific to the geographic location of the project and the nature of the project. The objective of the assessment would be to understand the risk exposure of the project and possible impacts of the project on the risk environment. This level of risk assessment will complement the Portfolio level assessment, given that the operating context from one location to another differs greatly in Somalia. Methodology on GBV risk assessment, including a risk tool, has been developed. Additional resources to inform analysis include the Violence Against Women and Girls Resource Guidance9 and the IASC Guidelines for Integrating GBV in Humanitarian Operations.10 Secondly, the risk profile in each sector may differ, although it should be noted that SEA/GBV risks are inherent in any project that changes the dynamics relating to power, resources and social interactions. Variations in risk—and appropriate mitigation measures—should be captured and reflected in the country context description, in the risk rating for environmental and social standards and in any safeguard instruments to be developed (e.g. ESIA, ESMPs, etc.), along with suggested mitigation measures.

Depending on the level of risk identified, key measures should be integrated into project design to prevent, mitigate or respond to risks. A table outlining Bank guidance for advised or recommended measures—contingent on risk level—is available in the forthcoming GBV Good Practice Note and provides the primary point of reference for Task Teams.

Develop community engagement strategy to include outreach on project risks, the GRM functions and the project’s objectives. Task teams should look to community members as dynamic risk management partners; community members are often the most knowledgeable about locally relevant risks and protective factors and are critical stakeholders in preventing and responding to SEA/GBV. It is also critical to ensure communities understand the risks projects present to local communities, expectations for contractor behavior and any mechanisms for reporting or redress should incidence occur. For those projects deemed particularly high risk of SEA/GBV, Task Teams should develop appropriate stakeholder engagement strategies to ensure communities understand key project risks before projects begin and what mechanisms for reporting, response or redress are available to them should something happen. Task Teams, in consultation with the GBV technical specialist, should also look to develop locally appropriate grievance redress mechanisms that includes measures to enable safe, ethical and confidential reporting on SEA/GBV incidence.

Engage with other partners to understand where existing dialogue, and therefore entry points, may exist. this would include scoping of actors that can provide services, e.g. health services, psycho social care, community coping mechanisms. Given the different and scattered levels of engagement across the country, the presence of actors will vary greatly and most likely will be concentrated in urban environments, particularly in the three regions of Puntland, Somaliland and Benadir (Mogadishu). A key entry point will include the primary participating organizations under the GBV Working Group but may also include key resilience-related NGOs/CSOs under the range of resilience working groups (BRiCS, SomRep, etc), as well as key bilateral partners.

9 www.vawgresourceguide.org
Leveraging the Project Operations Manual and other key instruments. In Somalia, rule of law, statutory and customary frameworks, and capacities to investigate and address SEA/GBV are limited, where they exist at all. In this void, the Project Operations Manual (POM) and other key project documents, including safeguard instruments (e.g. Environmental and Social Safeguard Management Plans, Contractor Management Plans), Standard Bidding Documents and other legal instruments that should be used as a platform for outlining roles, responsibilities and to clearly delineate accountabilities, within the sphere of influence of the project. The Task team should ensure that the POM reflects wider Bank requirements for inclusion of key SEA/GBV provisions in key documents including SBDs, ESMPS, CMPS, etc. Reference to key provisions should include clear codes of conduct, delineation of roles and responsibilities and key accountability frameworks on the part of the client, and possible responses and consequences to manifestations of SEA/GBV within projects. POMs should further articulate response measures to support any survivors should incidence occur, including in particular reference to referral pathways to provide holistic care. Any response measures should be survivor-centered and in line with global best practice for ethical and confidential care.

The project operations manual can also be used to describe codes of conduct expected of firms and individuals contract through the project and to outline expectations, for example, requirements for firms and individual to sign statements agreeing to abide by set standards. Finally, the POM can also include the opportunities presented by World Bank Financed project to prevent GBV/SEA through incorporating sector relevant, evidence-based activities that have documented positive impacts in reducing experiences of GBV. Examples of activities that can be added to projects and captured in the POM are provided in reference documents cited above in the Risk Assessment section.

Leveraging contract management and procurement requirements to address risks: There are ESHS performance enhancement provisions in the Bank’s new Standard Procurement Documents (SPD) to be adopted on a case-by-case basis. The new SPD have provision for contract provisions for enforcing implementation of necessary ESHS enhancement actions—including those related to SEA/GBV—and contractors/consultants/providers are required to meet certain minimum standards and reputations to qualify for the contracts award. These tools should be streamlined and applied on a case-by-case bases depending on the assessed level of project risk. Project teams should ensure continuous monitoring of the contractor’s performance on these provisions by ensure that provisions and identified mitigation measures (e.g. sexual harassment policies and worker’s codes of conduct) included in the contract to prevent SEA/GBV are being followed.

The Project Procurement Strategy for Development (PPSD) also provides an important opportunity to integrate considerations for SEA/GBV risk. The PPSD should identify the contract-related social risk factors and the appropriate mitigation measures to be put into place.

Clear grievance redress mechanism, socialized amongst relevant stakeholders, leveraging those with presence and capacity on the ground, making use of relevant technology: Task teams should develop contextually appropriate Grievance Redress Mechanisms for their project and ensure that it is uniquely designed to the context of Somalia and the project. World Bank experience in the design and implementation of GRMs with specific provisions to manage SEA/GBV complaints is nascent and still evolving, and presents an important area of learning; teams should consult with the appropriate technical experts to develop measures to enable safe and confidential reporting on SEA/GBV.
The CMU may want to conduct a review of GRMs with demonstrated effectiveness in Somalia to inform this process. Key provisions should include ensuring confidentiality and safety for individuals reporting grievances. Critically, however, it is important that projects do not collect data on GBV incidence through project GRMs unless a referral to service providers can be made, and GRM operators are trained on how to collect GBV cases confidentially and empathetically (with no judgement). Provided such requirements are met, data to be collected should focus on two key aspects related to the incident, including: i) nature of the complaint (what the complainant says in her/his own words); ii) if, to the best of their knowledge, the perpetrator was associated with the project. Additional demographic data such as age and sex can be collected as well.

The GRM should have a clear delineation of accountabilities and responsibilities, outlining the roles and responsibilities along the process of responding to reports as well as business standards. PIU staff managing GRMs should also be trained to manage complaints linked to SEA/GBV and ideally should have a dedicated staff member with technical expertise in GBV mitigation and response. Upstream discussion with the client on GRM will help develop an understanding of division of responsibilities, expectations as well as consequences and sanctions.

Project teams should understand that the likelihood of cases of SEA/GBV being captured by a standard GRM is low as they fall outside traditional points for help seeking in a community. Developing and adapting a GRM to capture such sensitive information will require both efforts i) to understand under what conditions would survivors or witnesses be willing to report (and to whom) and ii) to sensitize and raise awareness among communities of the potential avenues for safe, confidential and ethical reporting of cases. Sensitization efforts should also frame the GRM as safe space and entry point for access to services for survivors and survivor-centered care. GRM can also monitor the implementation of the accountability and response framework in relation to project-related GBV/SEA cases.

Project inception

**Building capacity of government to engage:** Project launch should be used as opportunity to engage the client (both PIU and accountable ministry) on the risks of SEA/GBV in the project and again to discuss the measure to mitigate, monitor and respond. This should include consideration of SEA/GBV risk and GRM in project communications. This should also include engagement with the Procurement specialist to ensure Procurement documents and processes mitigate against SEA/GBV risk. Targeted training should be provided to PIUs, alongside FM and Procurement training and should be embedded in training on Social safeguards.

**Building the ability of communities to engage:** Recognizing that projects, in their treatment of SEA/GBV risk, may be introducing new social norms into communities surrounding the projects, teams, through the PIUs, should consider outreach to local communities. This will support communities impacted by the project to understand what norms can be expected in the context of the project operations as well as raising the level of understanding on the use of the GRM.

Data on GBV incidents should not be shared without the consent of the survivor. When data are shared, all identifiable information should be removed to ensure confidentiality and anonymity.
Monitoring during implementation

Regular monitoring of SEA/GBV risks should occur throughout the life of a project. Monitoring key mitigation measures integrated into safeguard instruments such as ESMPs and CSMPs should be a regular part of the supervision process and should be flagged in key reviews, including ISRs, MTRs and ICRs (see below). For projects deemed ‘Substantial’ or ‘High’ risk of GBV/SEA, monitoring requirements should be built into Terms of Reference for Supervisory Engineers, TPMs (as mentioned above) or other monitoring actors, such as local NGOs and service providers. Regular engagement with communities in project areas, through appropriate citizen engagement tools should also take place and should be integrated into any community engagement plans. To the extent feasible, use of ICT, particularly mobile platforms, should be tested for effectiveness of reporting and feedback on this issue.

Focus on GBV risk in, ISR, MTR and ICR

Task teams are advised to monitor SEA/GBV risk during supervision missions and at project close. The CMU will review ISR risk ratings and overall risk description to understand how the risk profile is changing/impacted by the project – the objective being to work with the task team to understand issues as they emerge and to support teams in addressing them.

As part of the monitoring process, indicators can be selected for inclusion within the project Results Framework. It is therefore important that the indicators are carefully selected early on.

- **GBV indicators.** Sample project results indicators may include:
  - Successful implementation of agreed GBV Action Plan (Y/N);
  - Number of training courses related to GBV delivered;
  - Percentage of workers that have signed Codes of Conduct; and/or,
  - Percentage of workers that have attended the Codes of Conduct training.

- **GRM indicators.** To measure the effectiveness of the GRM, the publication of the statistics on complaint resolution in accordance with IDA recommendations on Citizen Engagement should be included as part of the Results Framework. Commonly adopted indicators include:
  - Grievances registered related to delivery of project benefits that are addressed (%);
  - Grievances responded and/or resolved within the stipulated service standards (%);
  - Project-supported organization(s) publishing periodic reports on GRM and how issues were resolved [including resolution rates] (Yes/No); and/or,
  - Number of GBV grievances that have been referred to Services Providers.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{12}\) This is not one of the recommended ‘Citizen Engagement’ indicators, but it is an important indicator from the GRM with regard to monitoring GBV levels on the project and identifying any changes to the project’s GBV risk profile.
Responding to incidence of SEA/GBV

Global best highlights the critical need to ensure a survivor-centered approach when responding to incidence of SEA/GBV. It is essential to respond to the survivor’s complaint by respecting the survivor’s choices and to minimize the potential for re-traumatization and further violence against the survivor. This means that the survivor’s rights, needs and wishes are prioritized in every decision related to the incident, and survivors must always be treated with dignity and respect. Every effort should be made to protect the safety of the survivor and any action should always be taken with the survivor’s informed consent.

Current approaches for effective, survivor-centered response emphasizes working with GBV Services Provider(s) and community-based organizations that are able to support the project in addressing any case of GBV that may be project induced, while also working to proactively prevent project-induced GBV. In projects with moderate to high risk of SEA/GBV, the project should identify GBV service providers (for medical, psycho-social, legal/security, livelihood, and other forms of support) in the project area prior to project appraisal, and contract at least one to support survivors of SEA/GBV who come forward an/ord to provide referrals to other available services. Selection of providers should be based in accordance with international standards that articulate a minimum basic package of services, ideally including case management support, health services, psychosocial support, police support and security, access to legal services, and shelter, if needed. These providers may be drawn from the intended portfolio-level community mapping or by individual project preparation activities of a given project. Any contract with a service provider should detail clearly the services to be provided, and what associated costs may be financed by the project.

Critically, provision of support or referrals to services should be provided to any survivor reporting incidence of GBV/SEA, regardless of whether the perpetrator is associated with the project or not.

Critically, provision of support or referrals to services should be provided to any survivor reporting incidence of GBV/SEA, regardless of whether the perpetrator is associated with the project or not. Additionally, response to incidence should not be oriented around investigation or substantiation of incidence that may have occurred, but rather around ensuring support for the needs of survivors. Investigation of incidence should be pursued only at the wishes and request of survivors and in accordance with legal processes, to be handled by appropriate authorities. Project and Bank teams should not under any circumstance undertake an independent investigation of any incident of GBV, including SEA, through the project. Similarly, they should not under any circumstances seek out survivors of GBV and question them about incidents. Determination of appropriate actions should be guided by consultation with a GBV expert and in alignment with global best practice.

Internal Reporting

New guidelines regarding internal reporting to management on incidence of SEA/GBV are under development and will be articulated in a forthcoming good practice note. The recommended steps for reporting and escalation will be linked to the ‘Safeguards Incident Response Toolkit’ (SIRT)
Annex 1: Assessment of risk at portfolio level in Somalia

World Bank engagement on GBV prevention and mitigation in Somalia

The Somalia Country Team has already undertaken extensive work to identify, understand and address challenges linked to gender-based violence and can leverage this existing work to improve risk identification and management across the portfolio. The Interim Strategy Note from 2013-2016 noted that GBV constitutes a significant challenge in Somalia and highlighted the need to focus on gender inequity and GBV as a cross-cutting issue and key dimension of vulnerability in Somalia. This emphasis has been rearticulated in the most recent Somalia Systematic Country Diagnostic and will be integrated into the forthcoming Country Partnership Framework.

The Bank has also supported a range of discrete activities including development of a pilot intervention, the Somalia GBV Inclusive Community Resilience and GBV Project. The activities under the pilot aim to increase resilience of vulnerable women through economic empowerment activities as a key mechanism to improve household stability and to minimize exposure to violence, while also addressing underlying gender norms, dynamics and behaviors that perpetuate violence in the home. This pilot, to be implemented by the International Rescue Committee and government partners in Puntland, also seeks to mitigate against the negative consequences of GBV through provision of holistic response services for survivors. The Bank, in collaboration with the British Government and UN Partners, also provided technical and financial support to the Federal Government of Somalia for the development of a National Action Plan on Ending Sexual Violence in Conflict with priorities outlined for 2014-2016.13

World Bank has also supported conduct of an inception study led the Rift Valley Institute examining the impact of protracted war and instability of men, male youth and boys and the associated implications for social cohesion, as well as communal and household security. Key findings of the study highlight the challenges men face in realizing binding and exacting expectations for what it means to be a man in Somali society, particularly in light of women's increasing engagement in economic activities and in the public sphere more generally. These findings underscore the relevance of program interventions engaging with men to address key shifts in gender dynamics, roles and relationships as a result of protracted conflict that may contribute to incidence of violence against women and girls, both within communities and within the home.

13 The framework of the NAP emerged following a 5-day consultative workshop hosted by the government and technically and finally supported by the British Government, UN partners and the World Bank in May 2014. The NAP was presented by the government at a Global Summit to End Sexual Violence in Conflict in London held in June 2014.
Annex 2: Risk Factors for Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Based on the Ecological Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIETAL— Broad factors that reduce inhibitions against use of violence against women and reinforce gender inequality</th>
<th>COMMUNITY— Neighborhoods, schools, and workplaces</th>
<th>MALE PERPETRATOR— With family, intimate partner, and friends</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP— Personal factors that influence personal behavior</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL— Societal norms that reduce inhibitions against use of violence against women and reinforce gender inequality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Norms</strong></td>
<td><strong>Violence in childhood</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Demographic characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Barriers to economic participation</td>
<td>- Social acceptance of wife beating</td>
<td>- Experiences of harsh physical punishment</td>
<td>- Non-equalitarian decision making</td>
<td>- Being a woman or part of sexual or gender minority group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Absence of legal framework addressing GBV</td>
<td>- Male right to discipline and control female behavior</td>
<td>- Witnessing parental violence</td>
<td>- Poor communication</td>
<td>- Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Weak justice and criminal investigation systems</td>
<td>- Tolerance of harsh physical punishment of children</td>
<td>- Physiological dysfunction, antisocial behavior, adult attachment issues</td>
<td>- High relationship conflict</td>
<td>- Level of educational attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discriminatory laws</td>
<td>- Stigma against divorced or single women</td>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Situational triggers</strong></td>
<td>- Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ease of divorce for women</td>
<td>- Male honor linked to female purity</td>
<td>- Acceptance of violence as a means to resolve conflict</td>
<td>- Sex, infidelity</td>
<td>- Displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal norms</strong></td>
<td>- Social isolation of women, girls, and family</td>
<td>- Acceptance of partner violence</td>
<td>- Power imbalance within relationship related to money, distribution of family resources</td>
<td><strong>Childhood violence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emphasis on women’s purity and family honor</td>
<td>- GBV taboo topic of discussion</td>
<td>- Men hold attitudes of superiority over women</td>
<td>- Stress produced by children or in-laws</td>
<td>- Child sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Women and girls less valued than men and boys</td>
<td>- Acceptance of significant spousal age differences</td>
<td><strong>Alcohol abuse</strong></td>
<td>- Alcohol use</td>
<td>- Childhood trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Masculinity linked to aggression and dominance</td>
<td><strong>Lack of sanctions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Delinquent peers</strong></td>
<td>- Economic stress</td>
<td>- Witnessing GBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic factors</strong></td>
<td>- Lack of legal and moral sanctions for violence; lack of enforcement of existing sanctions</td>
<td><strong>Socio-demographic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Patriarchal triggers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Level of development according to varying development indices</td>
<td>- Other community members do not intervene</td>
<td>- Young</td>
<td>- Female challenge to male authority</td>
<td>- Tolerance of wife beating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poverty (economic stress)</td>
<td><strong>Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>- Low educational level</td>
<td>- Failure to meet gender role expectations</td>
<td>- Low social support, lack of networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National</strong></td>
<td>- Male idleness</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Assertions of female autonomy</td>
<td>- Lack of sufficient personal income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fragile, conflict or post-conflict setting</td>
<td>- Community violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conditions of forced displacement</td>
<td>- High underemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sexist media</td>
<td>- Lack of safety in public places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inadequate victim care; lack of institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prevalence of transactional sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 The Ecological Model is a conceptual framework that consolidates three decades of thought and scholarship from multiple sectors on GBV risk identification. The model reflected here builds on the work of Lori Heise “What works to prevent partner violence: An evidence overview.” STRIVE Research Consortium, 2011.
### Annex 3: Project-Related Risk Factors for Sexual Exploitation and Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Bank Project-Related</th>
<th>Societal</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Male Perpetrator</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **National, regional**    | - Higher levels of GBV than regional average  
- Low education levels of national labor force  
- Limited services; low capacity for service provision for survivors; in particular, limited or no judicial or police services to facilitate redress for survivors  
- Lack of specific legislation addressing incidence of GBV | **Project size**  
- Geographic span of projects and communities that the project affects (e.g., larger projects intersect with more communities and are harder to monitor)  
- Duration—longer term projects increase risk | **Project workers**  
- Not local  
- Lack of sanctions for inappropriate behavior from employer  
- Increase in income of workers distorts power balance between workers and communities  
- Increase in income enables transactional sex and exploitative relationships | Working with only men or women in a household | Lack of information on how to report project-induced grievances |
Annex 4: Draft Terms of Reference for Somalia GBV Risk Portfolio Review

Introduction

This Terms of Reference outlines the roles and responsibility for a senior consultant to lead a portfolio review for the Somalia Country Team. The purpose of the review is: i) to assess key contextual and project-related risks that may contribute or give rise to sexual exploitation, harassment and abuse and other forms of GBV; ii) conduct stakeholder consultations and mapping of available GBV response services, and iii) recommend key interventions and risk management tools and policies for pipeline or active projects to address key risks to SEA/GBV. This assignment will focus on the Somalia Country Portfolio.

Background

Effectively addressing gender-based violence contributes to the achievement of the World Bank’s twin goals of poverty reduction and shared prosperity by increasing women’s and girls’ ability to participate in society and livelihood opportunities. Gender-based violence (GBV)\(^\text{15}\) – including sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse – is a prevalent feature in settings across countries where the World Bank operates; recent estimates by WHO indicate that 35 per cent, or roughly one in three, women worldwide have experienced some form of physical or sexual assault in their lifetime. The costs of GBV, both direct and indirect, are a staggering burden for households and economies. While the time horizon for reducing gender-based violence is necessarily affected by the need to shift norms and attitudes that underlie GBV given the widespread acceptance of violence against women and girls, it is generally agreed that effective interventions at the programming and project level in several sectors could help change attitudes and behaviors and enhance women’s ability to participate and benefit from development programs. (Ellsberg et al. 2014).

In order to understand and address more effectively key drivers that contribute to incidence of GBV, the recently released report by the Global GBV Task Force emphasizes the need to improve social risk assessment and specifically assessment and identification of key risks of SEA and GBV.\(^\text{16}\) In particular, the report highlights the extent to which existing World Bank-supported projects may compound broader contextual risks of GBV in a society, community or relationship that already contribute to prevalence of gender-based violence. Identifying and understanding both project-related and existing contextual risks linked to GBV and particularly sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse is therefore critical to ensuring World Bank projects do not create, contribute to or exacerbate existing dynamics or vulnerabilities perpetuating violence; it is also critical to inform the development of appropriate prevention and mitigation measures to be integrated into project design and to be monitored throughout project implementation.

---

\(^\text{15}\) GBV includes a range of violations, including i) intimate partner violence; ii) non-partner sexual abuse; iii) harmful practices; iv) human trafficking and v) child sexual abuse. It is expected that the country and regional integration profiles will highlight the most prevalent forms of GBV within each country and provide considerations for how to address these risks most effectively. http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/Gender/Arango%20et%20al%202014.%20Interventions%20to%20Prevent%20or%20Reduce%20VAWG%20-%20A%20Systematic%20Review%20of%20Reviews.pdf

In an effort to reduce potential risks presented by World Bank operations and to identify key interventions that may contribute to effective GBV prevention and response, the Bank is seeking a senior consultant to lead a GBV risk assessment to help document opportunities for the World Bank to meaningfully engage in GBV prevention and response and to mitigate potential risks of GBV in Bank-supported operations. This assignment will specifically include review of the Somalia Country Portfolio, including an assessment of key risk factors that may contribute to SEA/GBV in World Bank operations in country, identification of key measures to be integrated into project design to protect against risk of SEA/GBV or, should incident occur, to enable ethical, confidential and survivor-centered response and provide a baseline of information and recommendations for future investments. In particular, emerging recommendations should build on existing evidence on what works to prevent or respond to GBV, as tailored to respond to the level and types of risk found. This TOR outlines the scope of work, the anticipated role and responsibilities of the senior consultant and anticipated outputs and deliverables.

Objectives and Scope of Work

A senior consultant will be hired to oversee conduct of a GBV risk portfolio review for Somalia. The review will cover active and pipeline projects. As part of this assessment, the senior consultant will be expected to integrate and test risk assessment tools and methodology currently under development by the World Bank Task Team as part of efforts to assess country and project-level risks.

Specifically, the Somalia Country portfolio reviews will include the following principal activities:

i. Assessment of GBV risk in the given country context including aggregation of existing prevalence data, legal framework, national policies and programs and social norms relating to GBV
   • Analysis of the national legal framework and national policies and programs that address GBV. This will also include information regarding GBV survivor protection and response services available in each country and identification of the key players involved in enforcement;
   • Analysis of GBV prevalence with available data on multiple forms of GBV;
   • An assessment of social norms and help seeking behaviours relating to GBV;
   • Identification of key data gaps.

ii. Assessment of the risks in the current portfolio and identification of high risk sectors and/or projects:
   • Review the current portfolio to identify high risk sectors, including individual projects, based on risk assessment methodology currently under development by the World Bank, and provide analysis regarding what is known about these sectors and GBV;
   • In depth review of projects in each sector that may exacerbate GBV risk to provide concrete recommendations for how to prevent GBV with reference to the national legal framework and Bank policy and practice. This will include particular emphasis on projects related to infrastructure with labor influx, but also key initiatives linked to other sectors such as social protection, education, health and CDD. Activities should include consultation and engagement with key TTLs and social development staff.
   • This will include interviews with project proponents, beneficiaries and field visits. This review should include development of 2-page summaries of each project listing risks and key recommendations to address those risks.
• Interviews with relevant actors, including implementation agencies and private sector actors, including in particular contractors already engaged in Bank-supported operations.
• Review of contractors used to date (to the extent feasible) to assess performance/capacity for GBV Risk Management. This may require engagement with project teams and with relevant procurement colleagues.

iii. Stakeholder mapping of government and civil society actors that are currently working to address GBV in each country
• Identify the key international, national and local civil society organizations working on GBV, including a review of their role, mandate and relative influence;
• Identify international and humanitarian organizations that are also working in country that might be strategic partners for the Bank;
• Map services currently available to GBV survivors, assess quality and identify gaps in services.

iv. Recommendations for how to integrate key measures to strengthen prevention and response to SEA/GBV.
• Based on the above identified risks, outline key actions that could be taken in the short, medium and long term to reduce risks related to GBV, improve documentation and support clients/counterparts in the context of the existing portfolio (including capacity building). The recommendations should include guidance on how to strengthen projects to better protect against or respond to key risks linked to GBV, including retrofitting existing projects currently under implementation, or to develop and integrate new interventions or components into projects under preparation. The report should also identify opportunity for capacity building of both Bank staff as well as client counterparts and also opportunities for expanded dialogue with the government and other key stakeholders. Critically, recommendations should include identification of entry points within the pipeline portfolio to address GBV more proactively, including integration of GBV components in upcoming operations.

• Other key tasks deemed necessary by the World Bank Task Team.
Outputs

Key outputs under the assignment will include:

- Inception Report outlining proposed methodology for the Somalia Country GBV Portfolio Review;
- Draft reports summarizing findings of Somalia Country Portfolio Review;
- Final reports of the Somalia Country Portfolio Review (with the potential for the reports to be split into respective sections as standalone products); and
- PowerPoint presentations summarizing findings of Somalia Portfolio Review

Timeline for Delivery, Duration of Contract, and Task Management

The execution period for the Portfolio Reviews would be at least 40 non-consecutive days beginning XX, 2018. All deliverables will be subject to a review process (either internal or external) to ensure quality and alignment with World Bank policies, procedures and with good practice. The Senior Consultant will conduct this exercise as one part of a larger multi-country exercise and will also collaborate with and the Lead consultant on the wider review to ensure quality and consistency in methodology.

The task team lead for this assignment will be Verena Phipps, Sr. Social Development Specialist, GSURR, with quality assurance provided by Diana Arango, Sr. GBV and Development Specialist, Gender Theme Group.

Qualifications

The following qualifications are needed for the assignment:

- PhD or equivalent experience in social studies, gender studies, public health, anthropology, sociology or related field.
- Minimum 8 years of direct experience working in the area of GBV, with on the ground experience in Africa; experience working in fragile and conflict-affected settings considered an advantage.
- Experience in providing high-level strategic and practical advice and technical support to donors, multilateral and community organizations and policy makers on what works to prevent violence.
- Published knowledge of what works to address gender based violence, based on global impact evaluation data.
- Direct experience in collecting and analyzing data related to GBV and internationally acknowledge methods for comparing GBV data across countries.
- Active member of a global network working on GBV and/or have done work for such.
- Excellent writing skills.
Annex 5: Risk Assessment Tool – Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Numeric Rating</th>
<th>Possible scoring</th>
<th>Low Score</th>
<th>Medium Score</th>
<th>High Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence intimate partner violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Risk is having IPV prevalence above regional average per WHO 2013 (See Table 2, Annex 1.) Lower Risk is having IPV prevalence below the regional average per WHO 2013 (See Table 2, Annex 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of any form of sexual violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Risk is having a sexual violence prevalence above regional average per DHS data. Lower Risk is having a sexual violence prevalence below the</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Fill out the cells in yellow

Section A: Country Context

Country-level violence background

Notes or Comments from individual(s) completing worksheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Women who ever experience sexual violence” option</td>
<td>Higher risk is Tier III and Tier II watch-list</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Medium risk is Tier II</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Lower risk is Tier I</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department Trafficking in Persons report (Tier 1-3, with one low and 3 high risk)</td>
<td>Higher risk is if there is a mission</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lower risk is if there is no mission</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Peace-keeping mission</td>
<td>Higher Risk is having no laws on this topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lower Risk is having laws on this topic</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws on sexual harassment (click on the “sexual harassment” tab, scroll to the given country and in the first column, see the response to “Is there legislation that specifically addresses sexual harassment”)</td>
<td>Higher Risk is having no laws on this topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lower Risk is having laws on this topic</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws on child marriage (click on the “child and early marriage” tab, scroll to the given country and scroll right to see if “child marriage is void or prohibited”)</td>
<td>Higher Risk is having no laws on this topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lower Risk is having laws on this topic</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws on marital rape (click on the “marital rape” tab, scroll to the given country and in the first column, see the response to “Is there legislation that specifically addresses sexual harassment”)</td>
<td>Higher Risk is having no laws on this topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lower Risk is having laws on this topic</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Laws on domestic violence**  
(Click on the “domestic violence” tab, scroll to the given country and in the second column, see the response to “Is there domestic violence legislation?”) | Higher Risk is having no laws on this topic  
Lower Risk is having laws on this topic | 0 | 0.5 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Gender norms and beliefs**  
Justification of wife beating  
(Select Country in “Country” menu, --> click on Indicator box --> Complete List --> Select “Women’s Empowerment” category --> Select indicator “Attitude toward wife beating” --> select “Wife-beating justified for at least one specific reason”) | Higher risk is above the regional average  
Lower risk is below the regional average | 0 | 0.5 |
| **Help seeking to stop violence**  
(Select Country in “Country” menu, --> click on Indicator box --> Complete List --> Select “Domestic Violence” category --> Select indicator “Help-seeking to stop violence” --> select “Sought help to stop violence”) | Higher risk is help seeking below the regional average  
Lower risk is level of help seeking above the regional average | 0 | 0.5 |
| **National level capacity to respond to Gender-based violence** | | | |
| **National action plan on Women, Peace and Security** | Lower risk is having a NAP in place  
Higher risk is not having a NAP in place | 0 | 0.5 |
| GBV Working Group | Higher risk is not having a GBV working group in place. Medium risk is having a GBV working group with a national coordination level in place or a few sub-national structures in place. Lower risk is having a GBV working group with a national and sub-national bodies in place including the project area. | 0 | 0.5 | 1 |
| National referral pathway protocol? (no = higher risk) | Higher risk is no national referral pathway protocol. Lower risk is having a national referral pathway. | 0 | 1 |

**Country rating:** 0

**Section B: Project Context**

<p>| Is project in a humanitarian area of the country? Go to Country in the &quot;Countries&quot; tab--&gt; click on Map of the country and view &quot;Maps &amp; Infographics section&quot; and &quot;Updates&quot; for latest humanitarian and emergency situation. | Higher risk is humanitarian or emergency situation in project area. Lower risk is no presence of humanitarian or emergency situation in project area. | 0 | 2 |
| How much infrastructure construction, upgrading or rehabilitation does your project entail? (major = higher risk, | Higher risk is Yes. Lower risk is No. | 0 | 0.5 | 1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium quantity = medium risk, small amount = lower risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

According to the guidance from the labor influx note, rate your project as high, medium or low risk related to the level of labor influx. If there is no labor influx, choose the low risk option. This determination is a self-judgement based on project parameters, using the labor influx note guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher risk can be associated with large number of workers, small remote community (low absorption capacity), context with pre-existing social conflicts, high prevalence of GBV, weak law enforcement, presence of specific marginalized, vulnerable, ethnic groups, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During project preparation, consultation was undertaken with women’s groups, groups that advocate for children and adolescent rights, and other stakeholders. (Please note consultations should have provided a safe enabling environment for open conversation by women, recognizing that power dynamics in communities often limit women’s full participation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher risk is no engagement with women’s children’s and adolescents’ rights groups. Lower risk is engagement with women’s, children’s and adolescents’ rights groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During community consultations and project appraisal, issues related to GBV and GBV-related concerns about the project have arisen in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher risk is Yes. Lower risk is No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are military or paid security forces being contracted as part of the project? (yes = high risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty in the project area is in bottom quartile of country? (yes = high risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project in hard-to-supervise areas? (for instance, very remote or geographically diffuse projects) (yes = high risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban, peri-urban or rural? (rural = higher risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project construction near school route or other pedestrian access that women and girls use for their daily activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project able to monitor GBV and SEA risks across the full span of the work? (no = higher risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female workers in close proximity to male workers with limited supervision? (yes = high risk)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total risk assessment rating:

[1] To be updated every two years.
[1] To be updated every two years.

Global average is 7%. East Africa prevalence 11.46% (WHO 2013). For global and regional estimates of Violence against women see: http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/9789241564625/en/

[3] Described as conflict affected community in PAD changes risk to High
[4] This does NOT mean consultations should be undertaken with children themselves, but rather with experienced advocates for children
[5] Fill in Section C and D if either section A or B result in a high risk rating.
[6] To find national GBV working ask relevant stakeholder such as the ministry of gender, local organizations, women's groups, NGOs or multilaterals that work on GBV like UNFPA, UNWOMEN, UNICEF and WHO.
[7] Services needed by women and girls who have experienced GBV are: Health, Legal/Justice/Police, Psychosocial support, Economic/Livelihood support, Safety/Shelter
[8] Include guidance on what should be included in a Code of Conduct

Should include consultation with the country CMU team, who have the overview of the wider country portfolio and who should know (theoretically) if there is a GBV operation or GBV components in a given project. Usually the Program leads or country CPC should know this.