

MISCONDUCT RISK MANAGEMENT TOOLS



September 2019



Foreword

As a result of the UN Secretary-General's management reforms, my department has oversight over the conduct and discipline function across the global Secretariat, including for UN peacekeeping.

My department's new mandate to serve both field settings and non-field environments creates an opportunity to share best practices on conduct and discipline issues between different parts of the global Secretariat. My goal is to have an integrated, Secretariat-wide approach to upholding UN standards of conduct by all personnel – civilian and uniformed alike.

This guidance is relevant both for mission settings, and headquarters environments and it is therefore being shared across the global Secretariat. This guidance provides a set of practical tools to help the global Secretariat plan and manage risks relating specifically to conduct and discipline issues. The tools will help leaders, managers and commanders be transparent about how they intend to prevent and respond to misconduct by their personnel and hold them to account for doing so by being clear about 'who does what and by when'. Over time, my expectation is that these misconduct risk management tools will help the UN prevent and respond to misconduct more effectively.

We are aware that misconduct does not happen in a vacuum. An important part of planning and risk management on conduct and discipline issues will be to understand why misconduct happens, and the complex interconnection between the factors that drive misconduct. When conducting planning and risk management on misconduct issues, it will key to reach out to other relevant stakeholders and ensure that tackling misconduct is done in a holistic way.

Misconduct causes very real harm. When conducting planning and risk management on conduct and discipline issues, I urge you to see every step of the process from the perspective of victims. Ask yourselves: what factors put staff in a position of vulnerability and how can we prevent this? What can be done ahead of time to minimize stress to victims during the investigations process? What can we do now to make sure that counselling and other services are in place for victims?

I am confident that this guidance will provide a useful introduction to risk management on misconduct issues and urge users to provide feedback so that the tools can be continuously improved.



Catherine Pollard
Under-Secretary-General for
Management Strategy,
Policy and Compliance

Acknowledgements

This guidance was commissioned by the Conduct and Discipline Service, Administrative Law Division, Office of Human Resources in the UN Department of Management Strategy, Policy and Compliance (DMSPC), and written by Anna Shotton, Director of PeacePlan Ltd (www.peaceplan.org).

Special thanks is due to the following persons for their assistance in developing and providing feedback on this guidance: conduct and discipline experts from the regional conduct and discipline teams/units based in Kuwait, Mali and Lebanon; risk management, human resources and conduct and discipline experts from DMSPC, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA), the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), the UN Office at Geneva (UNOG) and the UN Office at Vienna and the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNOV/UNODC), as well experts from the UN Office for Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), the UN Office of the Special Coordinator on improving the United Nations response to sexual exploitation and abuse, the UN Victim Rights Advocate on sexual exploitation and abuse and the Enterprise Risk Management unit at UN Headquarters.

This guidance was launched in September 2019 and is available on-line at: <https://conduct.unmissions.org>.

The development of this guidance was made possible thanks to the generous contribution of the Government of the United Kingdom.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....p.1

Part 1: Risk Management Guidance.....p. 5

 Key concepts on risk management.....p. 5

 Step 1 – Understand the context and identify risks.....p. 8

 Step 2 – Assess risks.....p. 9

 Step 3 – Treat risks.....p. 17

 Step 4 – Monitor risks.....p. 19

 Communicate and Coordinate on risks.....p. 21

Part 2: The Tools.....p. 23

 Tool 1. Sample Misconduct Workplan Narrative.....p. 24

 Tool 2. Sample Misconduct Risk Profilep. 30

 Tool 3. Sample Misconduct Workplan Logframep. 34

 Tool 4. Sample Monitoring Planp. 38

 Tool 5. Sample Misconduct Risk Register.....p. 41

 Tool 6. Template Misconduct Workplan Logframe.....p. 47

 Tool 7. Template Misconduct Risk Register.....p. 49

Acronyms

CBCM	community-based complaints mechanisms
DMSPC	Department of Management Strategy, Policy and Compliance
DSRSG/RC/HC	Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General/ Resident Coordinator/ Humanitarian Coordinator
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ERM	Enterprise Risk Management
ESCWA	Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus
NGO	non-governmental organisation
NIO	National Investigations Officer
NPO	National Professional Officer
Missions	UN Field Missions
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OIOS	Office of Internal Oversight Services
PHP	Personal History Profile
RCDU	regional conduct and discipline unit
SEA	sexual exploitation and abuse
SMT	senior management team
TCC	troop-contributing country
UNDSS	UN Department for Safety and Security
UNOG	UN Office at Geneva
UNOV/ UNODC	UN Office at Vienna and the UN Office on Drugs and Crime

Introduction

1. Why have misconduct planning and risk management tools for the UN global Secretariat¹?

Planning and risk management are core management functions. Risk management can help the global Secretariat be more effective in how it addresses misconduct in three key ways.

Firstly, risk management supports better decision-making on conduct and discipline issues. By understanding which forms of misconduct their personnel are most likely to engage with and why, UN entities can take more informed decisions about how to prevent misconduct. Secondly, risk management enables organisations to be more pro-active in how they address misconduct. By anticipating future threats, organisations can take actions now to reduce those threats or even avoid them altogether. Thirdly, risk management provides a concrete way to hold leaders, managers and commanders to account, by clearly identifying who is responsible for addressing specific risks, what actions they must take and by when.

2. How can these tools help my organisation?

Enterprise Risk Management is instrumental to align the understanding of objectives and related risks at different levels in the Organization, provide management with the necessary tools to identify the risks that may affect the functioning of their operations, understand the root causes of risk and design proper response strategies to prevent and mitigate them.

Once **the risks of misconduct in the organization** are identified and recorded in the risk registry, they will contribute to the development of a work plan, describing how the organisation will:

- prevent and mitigate the risks of misconduct by its personnel;
- reinforce internal control systems where needed, to prevent and mitigate these risks;
- implement a continual improvement cycle that will be informed by the risk register and which will in turn provide information to update the register itself;
- enforce UN standards of conduct when misconduct occurs (e.g. through investigations) and support victims of misconduct by UN personnel.

The risk register describes the main risks to the successful achievement of this workplan and how these risks will be mitigated and managed.

3. When is it appropriate to develop a workplan and risk register covering all forms of misconduct?

In some country settings, there have been few incidents in the past of UN personnel engaging in sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) of the population, and the risk of UN personnel engaging in this form of misconduct is perceived to be low. Instead, other forms of misconduct

¹ This section is based on the [DPKO-DFS SEA Risk Management Toolkit \(2018\)](#)

are more prevalent and are more likely to occur, e.g. sexual harassment, abuse of authority, fraud and theft. In such situations, it is important to have a broader risk register and workplan that cover all forms of misconduct, including SEA.

All UN entities are already required to produce a yearly Action Plan describing how they will prevent and respond to SEA². Information from this SEA Action Plan can be lifted and included into this broader workplan and risk register covering all forms of misconduct.

4. Who should use these tools?

All managers should be familiar with the risks for misconduct in their operations, as these risks might affect a wide-variety of functions that are performed across entities and different functional areas, human resources, travel, finance and budget, procurement, property management, etc.

In addition, UN Field Missions, the primary users will be conduct and discipline experts. In non-mission settings, the primary users will be focal point(s) responsible for handling misconduct issues (e.g. from the human resources section). These conduct and discipline experts and focal points are referred to as “users” in this guidance.

5. What tools are provided and how do I use them?

This guidance is divided into two parts. Part 1 contains the tools, and part 2 contains guidance on risk management.

Part 1: The Tools

Tools 1-5 consist of an example of a workplan and risk register covering all forms of misconduct, including SEA. These examples are excerpts from a regional misconduct workplan and risk register covering multiple UN Field Missions and Offices; information and data has been anonymized. Tools 6 and 7 are empty templates.

Tool 1. Sample Misconduct Workplan Narrative provides an example of a narrative part of a workplan, which includes information on the external context and key workplan results and priorities.

Tool 2. Sample Misconduct Risk Profile is an example of a risk profile for a region, which describes all the forms of misconduct that UN personnel in that region are likely to engage in, the underlying risk factors, and an assessment of which risks are most severe. This tool can be used as a visual dashboard to explain which risks are most severe and should be the focus on the UN entity’s attention.

Tool 3. Sample Misconduct Workplan Logframe³ is an example of a logframe containing the key results to be achieved on conduct and discipline issues, key activities to be implemented

² Memo of 9 April 2018 from the UN Secretary-General’s Chef de Cabinet entitled ‘Request for Submission of 2018 Action Plans to Prevent and Respond to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse’

³ A logical framework (logframe) is defined as a “Management tool...used to identify...elements of a programme... (objective, expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement, outputs and inputs)...and their casual relationships,

by each mission/office in the region, and the status of implementation of the activities. This document is presented as a matrix and acts as a handy summary of the annual workplan. It is a useful management tool to discuss progress in implementing the workplan.

Tool 4. Sample Monitoring Plan contains key performance indicators to measure progress towards the three outcomes⁴ of the workplan as well as information about baselines (i.e. the situation at the start of the planning period), targets (i.e. the situation at the end of the planning period) as well as data sources.

Tool 5. Sample Misconduct Risk Register provides an example of a risk register. The risk register relates directly to the misconduct workplan since it describes the main risks to the achievement of the results described in the misconduct workplan and how these will be addressed.

Tool 6. Template Misconduct Workplan Logframe provides a format for a logframe for a regional workplan covering all forms of misconduct in Word.

Tool 7. Template Misconduct Risk Register provides a format for a regional risk register in Excel.

Part 2: Risk Management Guidance

Users should follow the risk management process described in part 2 of the guidance to develop a risk register. The guidance in part 2 provides a simplified risk management process, originally described in the [DPKO-DFS SEA Risk Management Toolkit \(2018\)](#) and adapted to cover all forms of misconduct as well as non-mission settings. This risk management process is aligned with the UN's Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) policy and guidelines (2018).

6. Can I tailor the tools to my organisation's context and needs?

Yes. Users are encouraged to adapt the tools to their context and needs. The sample workplan and risk register contains examples of workplan activities and misconduct risks for one specific region. In other settings, other misconduct risks may arise such as the risk of UN personnel engaging in unauthorised outside activities (e.g. unauthorized teaching at a local university) or failure to honour private legal obligations (e.g. failure to pay rent or child support payments) as well as risks relating to misconduct by implementing partners (e.g. fraud or misuse of project funds). Users will need to conduct their own risk analysis to identify specific risks for their organisation and context.

7. Are these tools useful for a small office where misconduct allegations are rare?

as well as the assumptions and external factors that may influence success or failure..." Source: [DPKO-DFS Planning Toolkit](#) (2012).

⁴ Outcomes are produced as a result of the programme's outputs. For example, outcomes could be changes to behaviour, conditions, institutions, policies or laws. A UN Field Mission contributes to outcomes together with many other actors such as troop- and police-contributing countries, the Office of Internal Oversight Services, and UN Headquarters.

Yes. In an organisation where historically there have been few incidents of misconduct in the past and there are few staff dedicated to conduct and discipline issues, a “light touch approach” may be preferable. In such situations, it may be enough to produce a workplan on misconduct issues that consists of a logframe only (using Tool 3) as well as a risk register (using Tool 5). In UN entities facing a higher risk of misconduct, a comprehensive workplan and risk register is likely to be more appropriate, using all five tools provided.

Options for approaching risk management



8. How were the tools developed?

The tools were developed through a planning and risk management workshop conducted in 2018 with regional conduct and discipline teams based in Kuwait, Mali and Lebanon, all of which have regional mandates covering multiple UN Field Missions and Offices. A number of key informant interviews were also held in early 2019 with a selection of UN departments and offices at Headquarters, offices away from Headquarters and regional commissions to understand how to adapt the tools to their needs.

9. Will these tools be reviewed?

The content of this guidance is expected to be reviewed by December 2021, with a view to incorporating good practices and lessons learned from users across the global Secretariat.

Key concepts on risk management

What is a risk?

A risk is an uncertain event in the future that, if it happens, would affect the achievement of the UN entity's objectives. Typically, UN entities have three key objectives on misconduct. These are:

- Objective 1: To prevent misconduct by UN personnel
- Objective 2: To enforce UN standards of conduct on misconduct when it occurs (e.g. by investigating allegations of misconduct)
- Objective 3: To assist victims of misconduct by UN personnel

Although risks can also be positive opportunities that enhance the achievement of the UN's efforts to uphold UN standards of conduct, this guidance will focus on risks that are negative threats that would harm the successful achievement of the UN entity's objectives on misconduct.

A risk is an event that may or may not happen. For example, a common challenge facing some misconduct investigations in the past has been the difficulty to substantiate what appears to be a credible allegation because evidence has been unavailable or difficult to authenticate. Some investigations will most likely suffer from this problem again in the future, but this is not certain to be the case in all future investigations. "The evidence in misconduct cases is unavailable or difficult to authenticate" is therefore a risk because it is an uncertain event in the future that would harm the achievement of the UN entity's objective of enforcing UN standards of conduct when misconduct occurs (objective 2).

A risk is often confused with its cause or its consequence. **A risk has 1 or more causes: these causes are also known as "risk factors".** For example, the evidence in misconduct cases is sometimes unavailable or difficult to authenticate because it may have been improperly collected and contaminated in the process, witnesses may have moved away and can't be traced, and investigators may not have the specialist skills required to conduct that specific type of investigation. It is important to understand these risk factors, since it may be possible to address some of these causes and thus reduce the likelihood of this risk happening.

A risk also has 1 or more consequences. For example, the risk that evidence in misconduct cases is unavailable or difficult to authenticate would make it difficult to substantiate the allegation, which in turn would result in impunity for perpetrators, further trauma and harm to victims or witnesses, a perception of a UN cover-up and damage to the UN's credibility and mandate/programme implementation. Again, it is important to understand the consequences of the risks, as these may also need to be addressed. For example, to minimize public perception of a UN cover-up in future investigations where the evidence was difficult to

authenticate, the UN entity might need to conduct external communications activities now to explain the process of an investigation and its challenges.

Box 1. Definition of risk

Risk is the effect of uncertainty on objectives.

Source: ISO 31000: Risk Management (2018), International Organization for Standardization.

What is risk management?

Risk management is the process of identifying, assessing, treating and monitoring risks to the UN entity's successful achievement of its objectives. A simplified risk management process is described in **Table 1** below, which can be applied to risk management of misconduct issues. This process has 4 key steps and 10 actions. Communicating and coordinating on risks happens throughout the process.

After going through the risk management process, UN entities will have everything they need to produce a "risk register". A risk register is a matrix listing key risks that threaten the successful achievement of the UN entity's objectives on misconduct as well as information on how the UN entity will address those risks.

Risk management is best done as a team effort: developing a risk register should involve all relevant parts of the UN entity as well as consultations with other UN entities operating in the same country(ies). This helps generate a common understanding of what are key misconduct risks to the UN entity's objectives and how best to address them. It also increases buy-in to the UN entity's risk management plan.

Putting in place a risk management process on misconduct for the first time will take dedicated time and effort. However, don't be put off. Once the basics are in place, risk management will become a lot easier and faster.

Table 1. The 4 Steps and 10 Actions of Misconduct Risk Management

4 STEPS	10 ACTIONS
Step 1 – Understand the context and identify risks	1. Analyse the external context, UN entity’s profile and mandate/programme of work and identify ALL risks to the UN entity’s objectives on misconduct. Insert these into the risk register.
Step 2 – Assess risks	2. Assess the likelihood of the risk occurring 3. Assess the impact of the risk on the objective 4. Assess the effectiveness of existing controls for the risk 5. Assess the severity of the residual risk 6. Identify the priority risks for the UN entity to focus on
Step 3 – Treat risks	7. Identify a risk treatment plan and insert this into the risk register <u>The misconduct risk register is now complete and ready to use.</u>
Step 4 – Monitor risks	8. Use the risk register to review risks and take decisions on how best to address them 9. Conduct trend analysis to determine whether risks are changing 10. Conduct a new risk analysis when needed
Communicate and coordinate on risks (done throughout)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain internally and externally how the UN entity is addressing misconduct risks • Coordinate with others on misconduct risk management

Step 1- Understand the context and identify risks

What is the purpose of step 1?

The purpose of step 1 is:

- To understand the external context, the profile and mandate/programme of work of the UN entity
- To identify all risks to the UN entity's objectives on misconduct
- To identify the causes and consequences of those risks
- To define what the misconduct workplan should focus on

Action 1. Analyse the external context, UN entity's profile and mandate/programme, and identify ALL risks to the UN entity's objectives on misconduct. Insert these into the risk register.

Conduct situation analysis to understand the external context as well as the UN entity's profile and mandate/programme.

Brainstorm and identify ALL risks to the UN entity's objectives on misconduct

Insert these risks into the risk register

The risk register should now include for each risk the following information: a risk ID, a description of the risk and its consequence(s), and a list of risk factors.

What information does step 1 produce?

At the end of step 1, users should identify ALL risks to each of the UN entity's three objectives on misconduct and related risk factors and insert these into the risk register. The risk register should now include for each risk the following information: a risk ID, a description of the risk and its consequence(s), and a list of risk factors.



Tip – Think carefully about how detailed you want to be when listing risks. If your risk register is too long, those reviewing it will lose interest. If it's too short, some key risks may be missed. As a general rule, a risk register for a large UN entity where the residual risk of UN personnel committing misconduct is high is likely to have 10-15 risks. To keep the risk register to a manageable length, check to see if you can merge similar risks into a more general one.



Tip – Insert the UN entity's objectives on misconduct into the risk register and write the relevant risks under each objective.

Step 2 – Assess risks

What is the purpose of step 2?

The purpose of step 2 is:

- To assess the likelihood of each risk occurring
- To assess the impact of each risk on an objective
- To assess the effectiveness of internal controls for each risk
- To assess the severity of the residual risk, after internal controls have been applied
- To prioritize risks and identify which risks should be the focus of the UN entity's attention

Assessing risk is more an art than a science. Although scales are provided to encourage a consistent approach, misconduct risk assessment is essentially subjective and depends heavily on the user's understanding of the unique context in which the UN entity operates. The ultimate aim of assessing risks is to identify which risks are a priority and should be the focus of the UN entity's attention. The scores generated in step 2 are only useful in so far as they help with this thinking process.

Action 2. Assess the likelihood of the risk occurring

For each risk listed in the risk register, assess its likelihood of occurring in the future.

Score the likelihood of the risk using this scale: 1 (rare), 2 (unlikely), 3 (likely), 4 (highly likely), 5 (imminent).

Insert the score into the risk register. Repeat for all risks.

How should UN entity assess the likelihood of a risk?

When scoring the likelihood of a risk occurring, users are answering the question: "How likely is it that the risk will happen in the future?". Users should score the likelihood of the risk occurring on a scale of 1 to 5: 1 (rare), 2 (unlikely), 3 (likely), 4 (highly likely), 5 (imminent)¹. The descriptions for each score can be found in **Table 1** below.

¹ The scoring scales are based on those in Annex A of the "Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control Framework (November 2018)" (p. 34-35).

Table 1. Scoring criteria to measure the likelihood of occurrence of misconduct-related risks

Score	Rating	Certainty	Frequency
5	Imminent	More than 90 percent	Could occur very frequently; or could occur at least once every three months (i.e. at least once per quarter) based on past data
4	Highly likely	Less than 90 percent	Could occur frequently; or could occur at least once every six months based on past data
3	Likely	Less than 60 percent	Could be recurrent but not frequent; or could occur at least once every twelve months based on past data
2	Unlikely	Less than 30 percent	Could occur but not common; or could occur at least every 1-2 years based on past data
1	Rare	Less than 10 percent	Would almost never occur; or could occur at least every 2 years or more based on past data

When deciding on a score, users should take into consideration two criteria: **certainty** and **frequency**. In other words, users need to ask themselves:

- How certain is it that the risk will occur?
- How frequently is this risk likely to occur?

For example, when developing a risk register for the upcoming year, users need to consider how certain it is that the risk will occur in the next twelve months, and how frequently is this risk likely to occur over the next twelve months. When deciding on a score, users should make a judgement, based on their understanding of the context and risk factors. If available, users should also examine any statistics on misconduct for the UN entity (e.g. past data on misconduct allegations, cases, investigations and victims), since data on what has happened in the past can give a good indication of what is likely to happen in the future.

Action 3. Assess the impact of the risk on the objective

For each risk listed in the risk register, assess its expected impact on the objective.

Score the impact of the risk using this scale: 1 (low), 2 (moderate), 3 (high), 4 (significant), 5 (critical).

Insert this score into the risk register. Repeat for all risks.

How should UN entity assess the impact of a risk?

When scoring the impact of a risk on an objective, users are answering the question: “If the risk happens, how severe will its impact be on the objective² in the UN entity’s misconduct workplan?”. Users should score the impact of the risk on a scale of 1 to 5: 1 (low), 2 (moderate), 3 (high), 4 (significant), 5 (critical)³. The descriptions for each score can be found in **Table 2** below.

Table 2. Scoring criteria to measure the impact of misconduct-related risks

Score	Rating	Description of Impact			
		Reputational	Operational	Safety and security	Financial
5	Critical	Reports in key international and national media/forum for more than one week	The objective ⁴ in the UN entity’s misconduct workplan can no longer be achieved; or Mandate/ programme implementation is severely affected.	Loss of life of UN personnel; or Loss of life of members of the population, including victims, witnesses and children born as a result of SEA; or Loss of life of personnel of UN partner organizations ⁵	The risk cannot be addressed using existing resources of the UN entity and additional resources need to be obtained (e.g. from Member States, UN Headquarters).
4	Significant	Comments in international media/forum	Significant, on-going interruption to implementation of the objective ⁶ in the UN entity’s misconduct workplan; or Significant, on-going	Physical injury and/or non-physical threats and harm to UN personnel ⁷ ; or Physical injury and/or non-physical threats and harm to members of the population, including victims, witnesses and	Addressing the risk requires significant re-allocation of the UN entity’s resources; resources need to be diverted away from mandate/ programme

² In **Tool 1 and Tool 3**, the UN entity’s three objectives on misconduct are the same as the workplan’s “outcomes”.

³ The scoring scales are based on those in Annex A of the “Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control Framework (November 2018)” (p. 34-35).

⁴ In **Tool 1 and Tool 3**, the UN entity’s three objectives on misconduct are the same as the workplan’s “outcomes”.

⁵ For example, organizations sub-contracted to implement programmes of UN entities such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

⁶ In **Tool 1 and Tool 3**, the UN entity’s three objectives on misconduct are the same as the workplan’s “outcomes”.

⁷ Examples of physical injury to UN personnel could include physical attacks by relatives of the victim or by violent demonstrators. Examples of non-physical threats to UN personnel include blackmail, intimidation, harassment and threats of violence.

			interruptions to mandate/ programme implementation.	children born as a result of SEA ⁸ ; or Physical injury and/or non- physical threats and harm to UN partner organizations. Note: If there is a risk of physical injury and/or non- physical threat, <u>the risk will always be considered as 4 (significant) not 3 (high).</u>	implementation to address this risk.
3	High	Several external comments within the host country	Moderate interruptions to implementation of the objective ⁹ in the UN entity's misconduct workplan; or Moderate interruptions to mandate/ programme implementation.		Addressing the risk requires moderate re-allocation of UN entity resources. No resources are diverted away from mandate/ programme implementation to address this risk.
2	Moderate	Isolated external comments within the host country	Limited interruptions to implementation of the objective ¹⁰ in the UN entity's misconduct workplan; or Limited interruptions to mandate/ programme implementation.	Loss of, or damage to, or misuse of UN infrastructure, equipment and other assets (e.g. offices, computers, phones, vehicles)	Addressing the risk requires limited re-allocation of UN entity resources. No resources are diverted away from mandate/ programme implementation to address this risk.
1	Low/none	Insignificant or none	Insignificant or none	Insignificant or none	Addressing the risk can be done using existing staffing and resources. UN entity resources do not have to be re- allocated to address this risk.

⁸ Examples of physical injury to victims could include bruising and injury, problems with the reproductive system, sexual dysfunction, contracting HIV or other sexually transmitted infections as well as unwanted pregnancy. Examples of non-physical threats and harm to victims, witnesses and children born as a result of SEA include intimidation, harassment, threats of violence, emotional and psychological harm, social ostracism, removal of financial support from relatives, exclusion from school, and arrest (e.g. for sex outside of marriage).

⁹ In **Tool 1 and Tool 3**, the UN entity's three objectives on misconduct are the same as the workplan's "outcomes".

¹⁰ Ibid

When deciding on a score, users should take into consideration four criteria, namely, the **reputational, operational, safety and security, and financial impact** of a risk. In other words, users need to ask themselves:

- What impact will the risk have on the reputation of the UN entity?
- What operational impact will the risk have on the UN entity? In other words, what impact will it have on the achievement of the objective¹¹ in the UN entity's misconduct workplan, and will the risk have a broader impact on other mandate/programme objectives?
- What impact will the risk have on the safety and security of UN personnel, of the population and of UN partner organisations as well as on UN infrastructure, equipment and other assets?
- What impact will the risk have on the resources available to the UN entity to implement its mandate or programmes?

Users should make their own judgement as to the relative weighting given to each of the four criteria, as this will be context specific. Understanding the external context, the UN entity's profile and mandate/programme(s) are critical to assigning an impact score. For example, during political tense moments, the risk of UN personnel committing an egregious form of misconduct may have a greater impact on mandate/programme implementation than at other times. Again, if available, users should also examine any past data available on the impact of risks that occurred (e.g. on the reputational impact of past misconduct allegations), since data on what has happened in the past can give a good indication of future impact.

Action 4. Assess the effectiveness of internal controls for the risk

For each risk, assess the effectiveness of the UN entity's existing internal controls.

Score the effectiveness of internal controls using this scale: 1 (highly ineffective), 2 (ineffective), 3 (significant improvement needed), 4 (limited improvement needed), 5 (effective).

Insert this score into the risk register. Repeat for all risks.

What are internal controls?

Any action that is taken by the UN entity to address a risk forms part of what is known as "internal control". These internal controls are listed as outputs and activities in the UN entity's misconduct workplan.

¹¹ In **Tool 1 and Tool 3**, the UN entity's three objectives on misconduct are the same as the workplan's "outcomes".

How should UN entities assess the effectiveness of internal controls?

When scoring the effectiveness of internal controls, users are answering the question: “How effective are the UN entity’s internal controls at reducing the likelihood and/or impact of this risk?”. Users should score the effectiveness of internal controls on a scale of 1 to 5: 1 (highly ineffective), 2 (ineffective), 3 (significant improvement needed), 4 (limited improvement needed), 5 (effective)¹². The descriptions for each score can be found in **Table 3** below. In deciding how to score, users should use subjective judgement as well as any data from formal misconduct risk assessment visits¹³ to UN premises that examine the adequacy of internal controls.

Table 3. Scoring criteria to measure the effectiveness of internal controls on misconduct

Score	Rating	Description
5	Effective	Controls are properly designed and operating as intended. Management activities are effective in managing and mitigating risks.
4	Limited improvement needed	Controls and/or management activities are properly designed and operating somewhat effectively, with some opportunities for improvement identified
3	Significant improvement needed	Key controls and/or management activities in place, with significant opportunities for improvement identified
2	Ineffective	Limited controls and/or management activities are in place, high level of risk remains. Controls and/or management activities are designed and are somewhat ineffective in efficiently mitigating risk or driving efficiency.
1	Highly ineffective	Controls and/or management activities are non-existent or have major deficiencies and do not operate as intended. Controls and/or management activities as designed are highly ineffective in efficiently mitigating risk.

¹² Source: Annex A, “Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control Framework (November 2018)” (p.35)

¹³ For a sample format for a misconduct/SEA risk assessment visit, see the [DPKO-DFS SEA Risk Management Toolkit \(2018\)](#)

Action 5. Assess the severity of the residual risk

For each risk, assess the severity of the residual risk, after the effectiveness of internal controls has been taken into account.

Score the severity of the residual risk using this colour-coded scale: Very High (Red), High (Orange), Medium (Yellow), Low (Green).

Insert this score into the risk register. Repeat for all risks.

What is residual risk?

The residual risk is the risk after the effectiveness of internal controls has been taken into account. When scoring the severity of the residual risk, users are answering the question: “How severe is the risk, after the effectiveness of existing internal controls has been taken into account?”. Users should score the risks on a 4-point scale that is colour-coded using a traffic light system: Very High (Red), High (Orange), Medium (Yellow), Low (Green)¹⁴. In deciding how to score the residual risk, users should use subjective judgement. The descriptions for each score can be found in **Table 4** below. As the severity of the risk increases, so does the level of attention given to it by UN leadership, managers and commanders.

Table 4. Criteria to measure the severity of residual risk

Scoring	Rating	Description
Red	Very High	Very high risks are perceived to be of greatest importance and require the most attention from UN entity leadership, managers and commanders. Treatment action is likely to continuously involve UN entity leadership. Treatment action may also involve UN Headquarters and Member States.
Amber	High	High risks require dedicated focus and specific remedial action. Treatment action is likely to regularly involve UN entity leadership and continuously involve UN entity managers and commanders.
Yellow	Moderate	Moderate risks require specific remedial measures or monitoring measures. Treatment action is likely to involve specific actions by UN entity managers and commanders, or monitoring of risks.
Green	Low	Low risks require periodic monitoring to provide assurance that the level of risk is not increasing.

¹⁴ Based on: “Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control Framework (November 2018)” (p.37)

Action 6. Identify the priority risks for the UN entity to focus on

Identify risks that are a priority for the UN entity to consider: these should be the focus of the UN entity's efforts.

How to decide which risks are a priority?

Not all risks deserve equal attention. UN entity leadership, managers and commanders have limited time and need to focus their attention on the biggest risks. The decision on which risks are a priority should be based partly on the severity of the residual risk (i.e. the more severe the residual risk, the more it is a priority) and partly on other factors. For instance, since all UN entities have the responsibility first and foremost to try to prevent acts of misconduct, risks to this objective will need to be prioritized. Other issues to consider include how urgent it is to address the risk, whether one risk needs to be tackled before another can be addressed, and the extent to which the UN entity can influence the risk. The decision on which risks are a priority is best done in a consultative way.



Tip - Put the words “priority” in the risk description of priority risks. This gives a clear signal that the UN entity should focus its attention on these risks.



Tip - Sort the risk register in descending order of severity of residual risk so that the “Very High” risks are at the top of the risk register and “Low” risks are at the bottom of the risk register. This will focus management’s attention on the more severe risks at the top of the list.

What information does step 2 produce?

Users should now add to the risk register five different scores for each risk: a score for likelihood, for impact, for the effectiveness of internal controls and for the severity of residual risks.

Users then prioritize risks and identify which risks should be the focus of the UN entity's attention.

Step 3 – Treat risks

What is the purpose of step 3?

The purpose of step 3 is:

- To identify measures to respond to each risk
- To assign an action owner and due date to each risk response

Action 7. Identify a risk treatment plan and insert it into the risk register

For each residual risk, identify 1 or more risk response with an action owner and due date. Insert this information into the risk register.

What is a risk treatment plan?

For each residual risk, identify your risk treatment plan. The risk treatment plan consists of a risk response(s) as well as an action owner and a date by which each risk response should be completed. Some risks will require several risk responses. In such cases, one action owner should be listed for each risk response.

When developing a risk treatment plan, users should always consider how they can avoid or reduce the negative impact of risks on victims, including through measures to support victims. For example, a risk treatment plan to treat the risk of an investigation taking longer than it is supposed to should include actions to reduce the trauma, harm and revictimization of victims, regularly inform victims of progress and status, and other measures to support and assist victims, including protection from retaliation and stigmatization.

What is a risk response?

The majority of the time, the UN entity will be trying to implement risk responses that mitigate the risk i.e. that either reduce the likelihood of the risk occurring or reduce the impact of the risk. Risk responses therefore typically involve either expanding existing internal controls that are already included in the UN entity's misconduct workplan (e.g. increasing awareness raising activities on specific forms of misconduct) or doing something new altogether (e.g. adopting a new set of standing operating procedures on conduct and discipline issues).



Tip – In the risk register, do not repeat your internal controls under risk responses. Think of internal controls as the day-to-day, on-going, routine measures that the UN entity has in place to address risks. Think of risk responses as extra measures implemented in addition to the internal controls.

A risk response usually addresses either a risk factor (e.g. weak mechanisms to receive complaints) or a consequence of the risk (e.g. reputational damage to the UN entity), which is why it is important in the risk register to identify not only the risk, but also its causes and consequences. That makes it possible to check whether the risk response is fit for purpose.



Tip - Make sure that the risk response is feasible to implement and cost-effective. Treating risks is likely to require additional staff time and other resources. In most cases, these extra costs can be funded using existing resources.

What is an action owner?

An action owner is the individual or office in the UN entity that is responsible for implementing a risk response. Action owners do not necessarily carry out the actions themselves but may instead ensure that the most appropriate person under his/her supervision or command does.

What information does step 3 produce?

Users should now add to the risk register the following information for each risk: 1 or more risk response with an action owner and due date.

The misconduct risk register is now complete and ready to use.

Step 4 – Monitor risks

What is the purpose of step 4?

The purpose of step 4 is:

- To monitor how risks are being addressed by the UN entity
- To monitor whether risks facing the UN entity are changing
- To determine if a new risk analysis exercise is needed

Action 8. Use the risk register to review risks and take decisions on how best to address them

At least quarterly, management¹⁵ should meet to review the UN entity's misconduct workplan and risk register.

During the meeting, use the risk register as a starting point to take decisions about risks and how to address them.

After the meeting, circulate an updated risk register that reflects any changes agreed to at the meeting. Don't forget to date the risk register.

How to use the risk register in management meetings

It is good practice for management to meet at least quarterly to review the UN entity's misconduct workplan and risk register. When reviewing the risk register, the situation in the upcoming three-month period (and beyond) should be considered and questions should be asked such as:

- Are the risks listed in the risk register still relevant? Should any new risks be added?
- Is the list of priority risks still accurate? Have new priority risks emerged? Should any risk be downgraded and no longer be considered a priority?
- Are the scores for the risks and internal controls still accurate?
- Do any severe risks need to be escalated to the attention of the UN entity's leadership?
- What is the trend for each risk? Is the risk remaining constant, or increasing or decreasing?

¹⁵ In mission settings, the "Standing SEA/Misconduct Task Force" is used to review the UN entity's misconduct workplan and risk register. This task force is an expanded version of the Standing SEA Task Force and addresses all forms of misconduct, including SEA. For further details about the Standing SEA Task Force, see the [DPKO-DFS SEA Risk Management Toolkit \(2018\)](#)

- What is the status of implementation of risk responses? Are they on schedule? Can any risk responses be marked as “completed”?

The risk register should be treated as a living document. This means that any new risks that appear outside of the scheduled meetings with management should be added to the register, and if needed, an extraordinary meeting called to discuss how to address it. If the risk register is not regularly updated, it will quickly become stale and reviewers will lose interest.



Tip – When a new risk is added, put the words “new” in the risk description. When a risk response is completed, leave it in the risk register and add the words “completed”.

Action 9. Conduct trend analysis to determine whether risks are changing

Use a combination of quantitative and qualitative data to build up a picture of how risks are evolving over time.

One approach to analysing whether misconduct risks are changing is to do trend analysis at the end of the year, using the risk register. Assuming that management meets at least once a quarter, by the end of the year, the UN entity will have the original risk register and three updates. This enables the UN entity to do trend analysis and look at how risks have evolved over the past year. These past trends can give an indication of what to expect in the future. For example, if the level of risk that “UN personnel do not report allegations of misconduct,” has remained constant throughout the year, it may mean that the current risk treatment strategy is not working and that it’s time to try a new approach.

Another approach to analysing whether risks are changing is to monitor quantitative indicators of risks and to supplement this with qualitative information on risks. For example, the UN entity’s misconduct workplan will have a monitoring plan that includes quantitative performance indicators. The UN entity could also include among these performance indicators some quantitative indicators to monitor risks. For example, an indicator measuring the “Proportion of investigations reports produced by the Mission’s Special Investigations Unit (SIU) that were returned to them for further investigation¹⁶” is a way to track whether the risk that ‘Misconduct allegations are not properly investigated by the Mission’ is changing. However, monitoring these quantitative indicators of risks over time will not be enough to understand whether risk levels are changing or remaining constant. Such quantitative data should be supplemented with qualitative data such as the views on changing risks and risk factors from, for example, conduct and discipline experts, human resources management

¹⁶ For example, an investigation report may be returned to the Mission’s SIU to request collection of further evidence from a specific witness

experts, UN investigators, UN staff unions, civil society¹⁷ as well as from feedback from victims.

Action 10. Conduct a new risk analysis when needed

This may be necessary when there is a significant change in the external context, the UN entity's mandate/programme and/or the UN entity's profile.

When to conduct a new risk analysis

There will be times when it is necessary to conduct a new risk analysis. This may be necessary when there is a significant change in the external context, the UN entity's mandate/programme and/or the UN entity's profile. For example, if a new programme requires a sudden increase in the number of UN personnel and deployment of staff to new locations, this will require a re-think of the UN entity's approach to misconduct and how it manages related risks.

Communicate and coordinate on risks

Communicate and coordinate on risks

Explain internally and externally how the UN entity is addressing misconduct risks.

Coordinate with others on misconduct risk management.

This should happen throughout the risk management process.

Good communication now can mitigate the impact of problems that happen later on. The UN entity's communications strategy on misconduct should include messages for both internal and external audiences describing key risks facing the UN entity on misconduct and how the UN entity is addressing them.

Managing misconduct risks is a collective effort, involving all parts of the UN entity as well as other UN entities, the host government and local communities. For example, to mitigate the risk that victims and other members of the population do not report misconduct by UN personnel, the UN entity will need to put in place confidential, safe and accessible complaints mechanisms, as well as conduct external communications activities to explain to the population what are the UN standards of conduct on misconduct, how to report complaints and available support for victims. These risk treatment measures will require the

¹⁷ For example, community-based complaints mechanisms (CBCMs) can provide valuable information about changing risks. CBCMs are typically present in mission settings in locations where there is a higher risk of UN personnel engaging in SEA (see also [DPKO-DFS SEA Risk Management Toolkit \(2018\)](#))

UN entity to coordinate with members of the UN Country Team, the host government and civil society as well as consult with victims themselves.

Part 2: The Tools

Tool 1. Sample Misconduct Workplan Narrativep. 24

Tool 2. Sample Misconduct Risk Profilep. 30

Tool 3. Sample Misconduct Workplan Logframep. 34

Tool 4. Sample Monitoring Planp. 38

Tool 5. Sample Misconduct Risk Register.....p. 41

Tool 6. Template Misconduct Workplan Logframe.....p. 47

Tool 7. Template Misconduct Risk Register.....p. 48

Tool1. Sample Regional Misconduct Workplan Covering Multiple UN Entities¹
(1 January to 31 December 2019)

1. Background

This workplan describes how UN Field Missions/Offices (hereafter “missions/offices”) supported by the regional conduct and discipline unit (RCDU) based in location X will address all forms of misconduct by UN personnel in 2019, including sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA), as well as manage related risks. The RCDU provides support on conduct and discipline issues to four missions/offices in the region: two special political missions (i.e. Mission A and Mission B), one traditional peacekeeping observer mission (i.e. Mission C) as well as one regional political office (i.e. Office D).

As of December 2018, the RCDU has four full-time staff: 1 Chief of Unit and 1 Administrative Assistant (national staff) based in the regional hub as well as 1 Conduct and Discipline Officer (a National Professional Officer (NPO)) based in Mission A and 1 Conduct and Discipline Officer (NPO) based in Mission B. In addition, there are part-time conduct and discipline focal points in the other two missions/offices (one in Mission C and one in Office D).

This workplan and related risk register was developed through a two-day workshop held on 6 to 7 November 2018 in location Y with the Chief RCDU. Consultations were subsequently undertaken in December 2018 and January 2019 with missions/offices in the region, including with their conduct and discipline officers and focal points.

2. Situation Analysis and Misconduct Profile

External context, UN mandate and profile. In 2019, no significant changes are expected to mission mandates, staffing/troop levels and mission footprint from the previous year for Missions A, B and C. However, it is possible that Office D will see a change in its mandate, with a resulting increase in civilian staffing levels. The misconduct profile is therefore expected to remain the same for all three Missions throughout 2019, with a possible increase in the level of risk of misconduct in Office D should staffing levels go up.

In total, these four missions/offices have just under 2,500 personnel², of whom 88 percent are civilians (2,143 out of 2,432) and 12 percent are military³ (289 out of 2,432). There are no police personnel serving in the missions/offices. Mission A and Mission B are the biggest missions in the region, with over 1,000 personnel each. Mission A has essentially only civilian personnel, most of whom are national staff (74 percent). Mission B has mostly civilian personnel (78 percent), who are primarily national staff (61 percent), as well as contingent personnel (22 personnel) in the form of two guard units. Mission C is a small mission with 120 personnel, composed of similar numbers of civilians

¹ This sample workplan is for a regional conduct and discipline unit serving multiple UN field missions and offices. However, this tool can equally be used by a single UN entity wanting to develop a country-level, regional or global misconduct workplan, or by a UN entity providing conduct and discipline support services to other UN entities.

² [Detailed staffing breakdown for each Mission/Office and data source]

³ Both members of military contingents as well as UN Military Observers with the legal status of “experts on mission”.

and military observers. Office D is a small office with around 30 civilian personnel, who are primarily national staff. Gender balance is poor across all the four missions/offices: women represent 12 percent of all personnel in Mission A, 20 percent of all personnel in Missions B and C, and 30 percent of all personnel in Office D⁴. UN personnel in each of these missions/offices are spread over a wide range of office locations: 11 locations in Mission A, six locations in Mission B, two locations in Mission C and five locations in Office D (one in each of the countries covered by the office).

Regional misconduct profile. The priority misconduct problems facing the region are: (i) **sexual harassment** by civilians against international and national female staff in Missions A and B; (ii) **harassment and abuse of authority**, primarily by international, senior and mid-level managers against national staff across all 4 missions/offices; (iii) **sexual exploitation and abuse of contracted cleaners** in UN-provided accommodation in Missions A and B; (iv) a wide range of infractions of UN rules and regulations by international and national civilians, particularly **entitlement fraud** (e.g. false medical insurance claims) **and falsification of personal history profiles (PHPs)** in Missions A and B; and (iv) **petty theft** in UN offices and UN residential compounds. Detailed information on the region's misconduct profile can be found in **Annex 1**. This regional level misconduct profile describes the main forms of misconduct risks facing the region, their likelihood of occurring, their expected impact on the effective implementation of mandates in the four missions/offices, the effectiveness of current internal controls to address misconduct across the four missions/offices as well as the severity of the residual risks facing the region.

As Missions A and B are the two biggest missions in the region, most allegations of misconduct relate to these two missions. In Mission B, over the past decade or so, 46 percent of misconduct allegations have related to sexual harassment, harassment, abuse of authority and discrimination and 21 percent to infractions of UN rules and regulations. In Mission A, over the past decade or so, 32 percent of misconduct allegations have related to sexual harassment, harassment, abuse of authority and discrimination⁵ and 36 percent to infractions of UN rules and regulations⁶. In addition, since the RCDU was established in 2014, most informal requests for advice on misconduct issues in Missions A and B have related to possible instances of sexual harassment, harassment, abuse of authority and discrimination (74 percent in Mission B and 36 percent in Mission A) and infraction of UN rules and regulations (21 percent in Mission B and 22 percent in Mission A). A 2018 survey revealed that sexual discrimination, harassment and/or violence is primarily targeted at female UN staff in country A: primarily at international female staff but also at female national staff⁷. Allegations of sexual harassment are believed to be under-reported across all missions/offices, and particularly in Missions A and B where victims and staff, particularly women, fear reprisals if they report such allegations⁸. Over the past decade or so⁹, there have been four allegations of SEA¹⁰ (Mission A (2), Mission B (2)), none of which were substantiated.

⁴ [Data source and date]

⁵ [Detailed breakdown of data]

⁶ [Period covered by data and data source]

⁷ [Detailed information and data source]

⁸ [Detailed information and data source]

⁹ [Specific timeframe provided]

3. Results and priorities for 2019

Results. The misconduct workplan contains 13 planned outputs (deliverables) to meet the following three outcomes:

1. Acts of misconduct by UN personnel are prevented
2. UN standards of conduct are enforced when misconduct occurs (e.g. through investigations)
3. Victims of misconduct by UN personnel are assisted

A **logframe** is attached in **Annex 2**, which contains a summary of the misconduct workplan. It includes a detailed description of the outputs, key activities to be implemented in the four missions/offices, as well as the status of implementation of the activities.

Priorities. In 2019, the **primary focus** will be on addressing **sexual harassment in Mission A and Mission B**, followed by **harassment and abuse of authority across all four missions/offices**. The main approaches to tackling these problems will be through: (i) introducing of new, tailored awareness-raising materials on these forms of misconduct¹¹; (ii) building the skills of supervisors and managers to resolve workplace grievances before they escalate into misconduct; (iii) providing informal advice to staff on how to resolve interpersonal conflict before it escalates into misconduct; (iv) creating new ways to facilitate confidential reporting of misconduct, particularly for female international and national staff.

In terms of addressing SEA, the focus will be on strengthening measures to prevent UN international civilians from engaging in **sexual exploitation and abuse of contracted cleaners** in UN-provided accommodation **in Missions A and B**, which is considered to be the most likely form that SEA might take in the region, as well as providing support to victims. Other key priorities are tackling **entitlement fraud and falsification of PHPs in Missions A and B** and **petty theft**.

4. Planning assumptions and risks

To achieve the results in the workplan, the following planning assumptions are made:

- Mission leadership, managers and commanders make it clear that addressing SEA/misconduct is a priority
- Military contingent commanders in Mission B exercise good command and control over their guard units
- Incoming personnel have been screened for a prior history of misconduct by UN Headquarters, the UN Volunteer (UNV) Programme and Member States, including for a prior record of SEA using the UN system-wide “Clear Check” Screening Tool
- Missions A and B provide adequate welfare and recreation facilities to international civilians in the Mission area to reduce stress¹²
- UN personnel, including victims of sexual harassment, trust in the confidentiality of the new reporting channels introduced in Mission A

¹⁰ [Detailed information about the nature of the allegations]

¹¹ These will be based on standardized messages developed by UN Headquarters for use globally

¹² High levels of stress have been linked to risk-taking behavior such as excessive drinking. In UN field missions, excessive drinking was found to have occurred in a number of misconduct cases (e.g. involving physical assault).

- Safe, accessible reporting mechanisms exist to allow contracted cleaners to report allegations of SEA to the UN
- The Mission's Special Investigation's Unit (SIU) or other investigative capacity has investigators with the right training and skills to investigate the forms of misconduct referred back to the Mission by the UN Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS)
- Adequate numbers of trained personnel are available to serve as panel members to conduct investigations into allegations of abuse of authority, harassment and discrimination under ST/SGB/2008/5¹³
- Panel members used to conduct investigations into allegations of abuse of authority, harassment and discrimination under ST/SGB/2008/5 are available in timely way
- Mission Conduct and Discipline Focal Points have sufficient time and resources to discharge their focal point responsibilities
- There is adequate security to allow conduct and discipline officers to conduct workplan activities in field offices in country A and country B.

A **misconduct risk register** is attached in **Annex 3**. This risk register contains the main risks to the successful achievement of the misconduct workplan, an assessment of each risk as well as information on how missions/offices will manage these risks in 2019. There are three priority risks this year. These are:

- **Risk 1: Sexual harassment in the workplace** by international and national civilians against other civilians (as per ST/SGB/2008/5) resulting in psychological and other harm to victims, security threats to victims and perpetrators, a toxic work environment and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission/Office
- **Risk 2: Abuse of authority and harassment** (as per ST/SGB/2008/5) by international and national civilians against other civilians, resulting in psychological and other harm, security threats to victims and perpetrators, a toxic work environment, lower staff morale, higher staff absenteeism and illness, higher staff turn-over and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission/Office
- **Risk 3: Sexual exploitation and abuse of contracted cleaners** by UN international civilians in UN-provided accommodation in Missions A and B, resulting in harm to victims (psychological, physical, social), possible arrest and detention for adultery or homosexuality, security threats to the victim or perpetrator, the risk of transmission of HIV and/or STDs, and damage to the reputation and credibility of the UN Field Mission.

Regular risk assessment visits will be undertaken to identify misconduct risks, assess their severity and propose measures to mitigate them. In Mission A and Mission B, formal risk assessment visits to field locations are conducted by the Conduct and Discipline Officers (NPOs) based in those missions. In Mission C and Office D, risk assessment missions are conducted more informally by the Chief RDCU during routine visits every six months.

¹³ Bulletin of the Secretary-General on prohibition of discrimination, harassment, including sexual harassment, and abuse of authority, dated 11 February 2008

5. Management and coordination structures

Mission-level management structures. The regional workplan is owned by the four heads of mission/office, who are ultimately accountable for addressing misconduct, including SEA. To assist him/her in discharging this responsibility, the SEA/Misconduct Task Force in Mission A and Mission B will oversee implementation of this regional workplan and risk register in their mission areas. In Mission C and Office D, implementation of this regional workplan and risk register will be overseen by the Senior Management Team (SMT).

Coordination. Implementation of this regional workplan and risk register will involve coordination with the UN Country Team (e.g. through the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General who is also the Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator in Mission A and Mission B), OIOS and Member State National Investigations Officers (NIOs) for Mission B troops, UN Headquarters, troop-contributing countries (TCCs) and with the Mission entities used to review the mission risk register.

6. Monitoring, evaluation and learning

Monitoring results and risks. Monitoring of progress towards the results described in this misconduct workplan and monitoring of risks and implementation of risk response measures will be done quarterly through the SEA/Misconduct Task Force in Mission A and Mission B, and through six-monthly meetings of the SMT in Mission C and Office D.

A **monitoring plan** is attached in **Annex 4** containing quantitative indicators to monitor progress towards the three main outcomes in the workplan as well as information on baselines, targets and data sources. Due to limited staffing in RCDU and the lower incidence of misconduct in Mission C and Office D, outcome-level monitoring will focus on the two larger missions where most incidents of misconduct occur, namely, Mission A and Mission B. Data on the indicators will be collected quarterly by RCDU for Mission A and Mission B, and analysis presented quarterly to their respective SEA/Misconduct Task Forces. This quantitative information on progress towards results will be supplemented by qualitative information from a range of sources, including NPOs in Missions A and B and conduct and discipline focal points in Mission C and Office D, to create a more nuanced picture of how the workplan is being implemented. Monitoring at the output level will be done in part through quarterly and yearly reporting requirements to the Conduct and Discipline Unit at UN Headquarters. Monitoring at the activity level will be done by RDCU and conduct and discipline focal points in the missions, with the aim of achieving any targets for activities set out in the logframe in **Annex 2**.

Review and learning. Towards the end of the year, the RDCU will conduct an internal rapid review of the workplan to assess the results achieved, identify good practices and lessons, as well as develop recommendations to inform the design of the next workplan. This will include conducting a trend analysis of data on misconduct allegations and cases.

During the year, any major changes to the regional workplan and risk register will be recorded in meetings of the SEA/Misconduct Task Force or SMT. The regional workplan and risk register will be formally updated once per year by the RDCU. However, it may be updated more frequently should there be a significant change in mandate, mission profile or external context that would affect the

likelihood or impact of UN personnel engaging in misconduct (e.g. if there is a significant increase in staffing in Office D).

7. Resources

This regional workplan will be implemented using staff time and other resources from all missions/offices mentioned in the logframe of this workplan (**Annex 2**), the staff and other resources of the RDCU office (see section 1 above) as well as part-time conduct and discipline focal points in Mission C and Office D. Many of the activities in the workplan will be implemented by the RCDU, whose core costs are paid through the Mission A and Mission B budgets, and whose travel to missions is funded through the respective mission budgets.

8. Review

This workplan (version 1.0) was approved by the following persons in the four UN Field Missions/Offices:

UN Field Mission/ Office	Approved by	Date
Mission A		
Mission B		
Mission C		
Office D		

Any amendments since are noted below.

Version	Changes made	Author	Date of amendment

Annexes

Annex 1. Regional Misconduct Profile 2019

Annex 2. Logframe 2019

Annex 3. Risk Register 2019

Annex 4. Monitoring Plan 2019

Tool 2. Sample Misconduct Risk Profile

**Annex 1. Regional Misconduct Profile for Mission A, Mission B, Mission C, Office D
for 1 January-31 December 2019**

Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)
1	<p>Sexual harassment in the workplace by international and national civilians against other civilians (as per ST/SGB/2008/5) resulting in psychological and other harm to victims, security threats to victims and perpetrators, a toxic work environment and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission/Office [Priority]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural attitudes of UN civilian personnel that tolerate or condone sexual harassment (e.g. perceptions in Mission A that younger and/or unmarried female staff are sexually available, perceptions that how women dress makes them sexually available) • Lack of understanding of UN personnel as to what behaviour constitutes sexual harassment • Sense of impunity among UN personnel • Weak tone at the top from leadership, managers and commanders about the importance of addressing prohibited conduct under ST/SGB/2008/5, which results in a permissive environment for such misconduct to occur • Poor gender balance • Working and living in UN compounds in Mission A leads to a blurring of private and professional lives and contributes to inappropriate behaviour targeted at international female staff in particular • Excessive drinking at Mission A's social centres contributes to inappropriate behaviour targeted at international female staff 	All, but particularly Mission A and Mission B	Likely (3)	Significant (4)	Limited improvement needed (4)	Very High

Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)
2	<p>Abuse of authority and harassment (as per ST/SGB/2008/5) by international and national civilians against other civilians, resulting in psychological and other harm, security threats to victims and perpetrators, a toxic work environment, lower staff morale, higher staff absenteeism and illness, higher staff turn-over and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission/Office [Priority]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discriminatory attitudes about women’s role in the workplace are used by male national staff to justify harassment and discrimination of female national staff (country A) • Lack of understanding of UN personnel as to what behaviour constitutes prohibited conduct under ST/SGB/2008/5 • Sense of impunity among UN personnel, particularly among staff in more senior positions • Weak tone at the top from leadership, managers and commanders about the importance of addressing prohibited conduct under ST/SGB/2008/5, which results in a permissive environment for such prohibited conduct to occur • The vulnerability of staff from countries with high levels of unemployment who fear that they may lose their jobs if they reject such prohibited conduct • Exploitation of the vulnerability of young, unmarried female national staff who are looking to move overseas for better opportunities (country A and country B) • Working and living in UN compounds in Mission A leads to a blurring of private and professional lives and contributes to inappropriate behaviour targeted at international female staff in particular 	All	Likely (3)	Moderate (2)	Limited improvement needed (4)	Very High

Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)
3	SEA: Sexual exploitation and abuse of contracted cleaners by UN international civilians in UN-provided accommodation in Mission A and Mission B , resulting in harm to victims (psychological, physical, social), possible arrest and detention for adultery or homosexuality, security threats to the victim or perpetrator, the risk of transmission of HIV and/or STDs, and damage to the reputation and credibility of the UN Field Mission [Priority]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural attitudes of UN personnel that tolerate or condone sexual exploitation of domestic workers • UN personnel have a sense of impunity due to difficulty in detecting sexual misconduct in private accommodation • Vulnerability of domestic workers due to their low levels of awareness of UN standards of conduct on SEA • Vulnerability of domestic workers due to high levels of poverty and unemployment 	Mission A, Mission B	Rare (1)	Significant (4)	Limited improvement needed (4)	High
4	Entitlement fraud (e.g. false medical insurance claims) and falsification of Personal History Forms (PHPs) among national staff, resulting in financial loss and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission [Priority]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff who are under financial pressure in their private lives falsify medical insurance claims to gain money; • High levels of unemployment in countries A and B create an incentive for applicants to misrepresent their qualifications in their PHPs or deny that a relative is employed in the UN in order to appear more competitive; • Fear of downsizing in Mission A leads to unethical behaviour and decreased adherence to staff rules and regulations. 	Mission A, Mission B	Highly likely (4)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate
5	Petty theft in UN offices and UN residential compounds, resulting in financial loss to the UN Field Mission/Office as well as personal loss to UN staff [Priority]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak criminal reference checks during recruitment process of UN contractor personnel • Lack of effective stocktake and supply chain management [Mission A] • Sense of impunity due to difficulty to detect petty theft 	Mission A, Mission B, Mission C	Likely (3)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate

Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)
6	Physical assault by international and national civilians, military (experts on mission) and contractors, resulting in physical and psychological harm to victims, and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High levels of stress due to social isolation and long rotation cycles, resulting in difficulty in managing emotions • Cultural attitudes of UN personnel that tolerate or condone use of physical aggression to resolve inter-personal conflict • Retaliation for perceived grievances and insults in the workplace (i.e. revenge attacks) • Alcohol-fueled fights between UN personnel • Weak communication skills of UN personnel • Weak management practices that have allowed workplace grievances to go unaddressed and fester 	Mission A, Mission B	Unlikely (2)	Low (1)	Limited improvement needed (4)	Low
7	Drunk driving and other alcohol-related offences by international civilians and military personnel, resulting in possible traffic accidents, including possible injury or death of UN personnel or the population, and/or other forms of misconduct, including physical assault and sexual harassment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural attitudes of UN personnel that tolerate or condone drunk driving, including peer pressure from UN colleagues to drive while drunk • Easy access to alcohol • High levels of stress due to social isolation and long rotation cycles, resulting in risk-taking behaviour 	Mission A, Mission B	Likely (3)	Moderate (2)	Limited improvement needed (4)	Moderate

Drop-down menus:

Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk
Imminent (5)	Critical - 5	Effective (5)	Very High
Highly likely (4)	Significant (4)	Limited improvement needed (4)	High
Likely (3)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate
Unlikely (2)	Moderate (2)	Ineffective (2)	Low
Rare (1)	Low (1)	Highly ineffective (1)	

Tool 3. Sample Misconduct Workplan Logframe

Annex 2. Logframe for the Regional Misconduct/SEA Workplan (1 January to 31 December 2019)

Impact/objective: To support the effective implementation of mandates in Mission A, Mission B, Mission C and Office D through a regional workplan addressing all forms of misconduct, including sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA)

Outcome 1 (Prevention): Acts of misconduct by UN personnel are prevented

Outputs (key deliverables)	Key activities	Missions/ Office	Status (comment)
Output 1: All UN personnel know what are the UN standards of conduct, including on sexual harassment and SEA	1.1 Provide induction briefing on conduct and discipline issues , including SEA for Mission personnel during planned Mission induction training (Mission A monthly, Mission B every 2 months, Mission C 2x/year, Office D as required)	All Missions/ Offices (All)	
	1.2 Provide induction briefing to newly-arrived contingent and unit commanders/ UN Military Observers/Military Advisers on conduct and discipline, including SEA (Mission A as required; Mission B every 6 months, Mission C 2x/year)	Mission A, Mission B, Mission C	
	1.3 Provide training of trainers to military contingents on conduct and discipline, including prevention of SEA (every 6 months to coincide with rotations)	Mission B	
	1.4 Provide ST/SGB/2008/5 refresher training and/or awareness briefings to civilian personnel (Mission A and Mission B every 4 months, Mission C once a year, Office D once a year)	All	
	1.5 Provide specialized prevention of SEA training to contractor personnel (every 6 months)	All	
	1.6 Managers monitor completion by civilians and experts on mission of mandatory online and classroom training on conduct and discipline issues i.e. on sexual harassment/abuse in the workplace; SEA (general course as well as the managers/commanders course); fraud & anti-corruption; and ethics and integrity. Target is 80% compliance in all Missions by 31 December 2020	All	
	1.7 Introduce new gender-awareness training to address discriminatory attitudes about women in the workplace	Mission A	
	1.8. Introduce new form to declare family relationships during recruitment process for national staff	Mission A, Mission B	
	1.9. Conduct internal communications activities on misconduct issues , including Head of Mission broadcasts on the duty to report misconduct (all), increased messaging to address entitlement fraud (Mission A and Mission B), and updating of Mission Conduct and Discipline Intranet sites (once per quarter)	All	

Outputs (key deliverables)	Key activities	Missions/ Office	Status (comment)
Output 2: All Mission leadership, managers and commanders know their personal and managerial / command responsibilities to address misconduct and have the skills to take action on incidents of misconduct	2.1 UN civilian personnel with supervisory responsibility to complete the UN Management Development Programme (MDP) to, inter alia, develop skills to prevent workplace grievances and inter-personal conflict from escalating into misconduct	All	
	2.2...		
Output 3: Mission-specific policies and procedures are in place to prevent misconduct	3.1 Review and update Mission-specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) on conduct and discipline to ensure alignment with latest UN policies, rules and regulations (once per year)	All	
	3.2...		
Output 4: Missions/offices have adequate monitoring, oversight, coordination and other preventative mechanisms in place to address SEA and other prohibited conduct	4.1 Conduct misconduct/SEA risk assessment visits , with support from the UN Country Team where applicable, to identify and assess misconduct risks, identify risk mitigation measures and monitor the status of their implementation (quarterly in Missions A and B, once per year (informal) in Mission C and Office D)	All	
	4.2. Hold meetings of the Mission Misconduct/SEA Task Force to review implementation of the regional misconduct/SEA workplan and risk register (quarterly)	Mission A, Mission B	
	4.3 Hold meetings with the Senior Management Team (SMT) to review implementation of the regional misconduct/SEA workplan and risk register (every six months)	Mission C, Office D	
	4.4. Participate in the Prevention of SEA (PSEA) Network Meetings with the UN Country Team	Mission A, Mission B	
Output 5: Mission Conduct and Discipline Focal Points know how to support their Head of Mission in preventing and addressing misconduct, including SEA	5.3 Organize an annual conduct and discipline workshop for Conduct and Discipline Officers (NPOs) and Conduct and Discipline Focal Points	All	Feb. 2019
	5.2...		
Output 6: Civilian personnel and experts on Mission are provided with adequate welfare facilities and counselling services to reduce stress	6.1 Provision of counselling services for civilians	Mission A, Mission B	
	6.2...		
Output 7: Job applicants and contractor personnel are screened for a prior history of misconduct/SEA issues before being hired/contracted	7.1. Verify reference checking procedures of contractors to check that they screen for a prior history of misconduct, including SEA, during the recruitment process	Mission A, Mission B	
	7.2...		

Outcome 2 (Enforcement): UN standards of conduct are enforced when misconduct occurs

Outputs (key deliverables)	Key activities	Missions/ Office	Status (comment)
Output 8: Accessible complaints mechanisms are in place to enable UN personnel, contracted cleaners and members of the population to report allegations of sexual harassment, SEA and other prohibited conduct in a safe and confidential manner	8.1 Establish new reporting mechanisms on sexual harassment in Mission A that young, female national staff feel safe to use	Mission A	
	8.2 Establish a new, confidential reporting channel for allegations of misconduct straight to the Deputy Head of Mission (DSRSG/RC/HC)	Mission A	
	8.3...		
Output 9: Missions receive, assess, process and refer in a timely manner all allegations of misconduct to OIOSⁱ/TCCsⁱⁱ (via DMSPCⁱⁱⁱ) for investigation, and when necessary collect and preserve evidence of SEA or other forms of misconduct	9.1 All allegations are assessed by the regional conduct and discipline unit and referred to OIOS or to HQ (for investigation by member states) within 3 days of receipt	All	
	9.2...		
Output 10: Missions conduct high quality and timely investigations, and supports the investigations of others (OIOS and TCCs)	10.1 Conduct investigations into allegations of misconduct referred back to the Mission by OIOS. Target: Investigation reports to be completed within 45 days of referral and investigation reports dealing with conduct prohibited under ST/SGB/2008/5 or ST/SGB/2003/13 to be finalised within 3 months of the date of the complaint	All	
	10.2 Ensure that all missions/offices have the up-to-date list of panel members for investigations into prohibited conduct under ST/SGB/2008/5 (roster is managed by the Office of Human Resources)	All	
	10.3...		
Output 11: Missions recommend administrative, interim and/or disciplinary measures in misconduct cases and implement authorised measures	11.1 Request/recommend administrative, interim and/or disciplinary measures in misconduct cases involving civilian and military personnel, including administrative leave with or without pay and repatriation of military and police personnel, and implement authorised measures. Target: Investigation and Panel Reports are reviewed and recommendations made to the Head of Mission within 30 days of receipt of investigation report for allegations of misconduct, but within 15 days for reports dealing with SEA.	All	

Outcome 3 (Victim Assistance): Victims of misconduct by UN personnel are assisted

Outputs (key deliverables)	Key activities	Missions/ Office	Status (comment)
Output 12: All victims of sexual harassment and other forms of misconduct are referred for assistance	12.1 Victims of sexual harassment are provided with information and/or referred to UN counselling services and other forms of support (e.g. legal assistance)		
	12.2 ...		
Output 13: All victims of sexual harassment and other forms of prohibited conduct, UN personnel and the local population receive information on the status and outcome of misconduct cases	13.1 Regular information-sharing with victims (UN personnel) on the status and outcome of their cases, with clear protocols and timelines for doing so.		
	13.2...		

Information as of [date]

ⁱ OIOS – UN Office of Internal Oversight Services

ⁱⁱ TCCs – Troop-contributing countries

ⁱⁱⁱ DMSPC – UN Department of Management Strategy, Policy and Compliance

Status	Explanations
	Green = on schedule
	Amber = potential for delays
	Red = no progress/significantly behind schedule
	Blue = completed

Tool 4. Sample Monitoring Plan

Annex 4. Monitoring Plan for the Regional Misconduct/SEA Workplan 2019

No.	Indicator	Baseline (1 January 2019)	Target (31 December 2019)	Data source
Outcome 1 (Prevention): Acts of sexual harassment, SEA and other prohibited conduct by UN personnel are prevented				
1	Change in the total number of misconduct allegations involving all UN personnel in the region reported in 2019 compared to the previous year (disaggregated by the sex of the alleged perpetrator) [Comment: The region covers Mission A, Mission B, Mission C and Office D.]	X misconduct allegations involving all UN personnel in the region were reported in 2018 (X misconduct allegations involving male alleged perpetrators; X misconduct allegations involving female alleged perpetrators)	Reduction in the total number of misconduct allegations involving all UN personnel in the region reported in 2019 compared to 2018	Misconduct Tracking System (MTS)
2	Change in the number of allegations of sexual harassment involving all UN personnel in Missions A and B reported in 2019 compared to the previous year (disaggregated by the sex of the alleged perpetrator and international/national)	X allegations of sexual harassment involving all UN personnel in Missions A and B were reported in 2018 (X allegations of sexual harassment involving male alleged perpetrators (X involving international men, Y involving national men); X allegations of sexual harassment involving female alleged perpetrators (X involving international women, Y involving national women))	Increase in the number of allegations of sexual harassment reported against all UN personnel in Missions A and B in 2019 compared to 2018 [Comment: Some of the allegations are likely to be historical. Workplan activities in 2019 are expected to result in increased reporting of these allegations.]	MTS
3	Change in the number of allegations of harassment or abuse of authority involving all UN personnel in Missions A and B reported in 2019 compared to the previous year (disaggregated by the sex and seniority of the alleged perpetrator) [Comment: Seniority of alleged perpetrators is categorized as follows: P5 to D1; P-2 to P-4; GS]	X allegations of harassment or abuse of authority involving all UN personnel in Missions A and B were reported in 2018 (X allegations of harassment or abuse of authority involving male alleged perpetrators (P-5 to D1 (X), P-2 to P-4 (Y), GS (Z)); X allegations of harassment or abuse of authority involving female alleged perpetrators ((P-5 to D1 (X), P-2 to P-4 (Y), GS (Z)))	Increase in the number of allegations of harassment or abuse of authority involving all UN personnel in Missions A and B reported in 2019 compared to 2018 [Comment: Some of the allegations are likely to be historical. Workplan activities in 2019 are expected to result in increased reporting of these allegations.]	MTS

No.	Indicator	Baseline (1 January 2019)	Target (31 December 2019)	Data source
4	<p>Change in the number of requests for advice received by RCDU from UN personnel in all four UN entities regarding potential incidents of conduct prohibited under ST/SGB/2008/5 in 2019 compared to the previous year (disaggregated by type of allegation) [Comment: these are informal enquiries that do not constitute a formal complaint, and are logged in RCDU's non-MTS database. The types of allegation are: sexual harassment, harassment, abuse of authority and discrimination]</p>	<p>X requests for advice were received in 2018 by RCDU from UN personnel in all four UN entities regarding potential incidents of conduct prohibited under ST/SGB/2008/5 (Sexual harassment: X requests for advice; harassment: X requests for advice; abuse of authority: X requests for advice; discrimination: X requests for advice)</p>	<p>Increase in the number of requests for advice received in 2019 by RCDU from UN personnel in all four UN entities regarding potential incidents of conduct prohibited under ST/SGB/2008/5 compared to 2018 [Comment: Workplan activities in 2019 are expected to result in increased willingness of staff to request informal advice]</p>	<p>RCDU non-MTS database</p>
5	<p>Change in the number of formal and informal complaints of harassment or abuse of authority received in the region in 2019 compared to the previous year (disaggregated by formal/informal and by UN entity) [Comment: The region covers Missions A, B and C and Office D. Informal complaints are the same as informal requests for advice and are logged in the non-MTS database. Note that a spike of formal and informal complaints is expected in March and October of 2019 at the time when performance appraisals are conducted.]</p>	<p>In 2018, a total of X formal and informal complaints of harassment or abuse of authority were received in the region (Mission A: X complaints (X formal, Y informal); Mission B:)</p>	<p>Increase in the number formal and informal complaints of harassment or abuse of authority received in the region in 2019 compared to 2018 [Comment: Workplan activities in 2019 are expected to result in increased willingness of staff to make formal and informal complaints]</p>	<p>MTS and RCDU non-MTS database</p>

No.	Indicator	Baseline (1 January 2019)	Target (31 December 2019)	Data source
6	Change in the number of PHP falsification allegations received in Missions A and B in 2019 compared to the previous year (disaggregated by mission and by sex of the perpetrator)	X allegations of PHP falsification were received in Missions A and B in 2019 compared to the previous year (Mission A: X allegations of PHP falsification (X committed by men, X committed by women), Mission B: X allegations of PHP falsification (X committed by men, X committed by women))	Increase in the number of allegations of PHP falsification received in Missions A and B in 2019 compared to 2018 [Comment: Workplan activities in 2019 are expected to result in improved verification of PHPs and a resulting increase in allegations of this nature]	MTS
Outcome 2 (Enforcement): UN standards of conduct are enforced when sexual harassment and other prohibited conduct occurs				
7	Number of misconduct investigations by the UN or TCCs that have the status of “pending” in 2019, more than twelve months after the allegation was reported to the UN (disaggregated by mission)	As of 1 January 2019, X misconduct investigations by the UN or TCCs have the status of “pending”, more than twelve months after the allegation was reported to the UN (Mission A: X misconduct allegations have the status of pending; Mission B: X..., Mission C: X...; Office D: X...)	Decrease in the number of misconduct investigations by the UN or TCCs that have the status of “pending”, more than twelve months after the allegation was reported to the UN	MTS
Outcome 3 (Victim Assistance): Victims of sexual harassment and other prohibited conduct are assisted				
8	Whether all victims of sexual harassment, harassment and abuse of authority were offered or referred to counselling and other forms of support [Comment: This includes referral to legal support where sexual harassment may constitute a criminal or civil offence under national law.]	In 2018, all victims of sexual harassment, harassment and abuse of authority were offered or referred to counselling and other forms of support	Yes, all victims of sexual harassment, harassment and abuse of authority were offered or referred to counselling and other forms of support	RCDU records

Tool 5. Sample Misconduct Risk Register

Annex 3. Regional Misconduct/SEA Risk Register (1 January-31 December 2019)

Workplan Outcome	Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)	Risk response	Action owner (Mission(s))	Due date
Risks to Outcome 1 (Prevention)	1	Sexual harassment in the workplace by international and national civilians against other civilians (as per ST/SGB/2008/5) resulting in psychological and other harm to victims, security threats to victims and perpetrators, a toxic work environment and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission/Office [Priority]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural attitudes of UN civilian personnel that tolerate or condone sexual harassment (e.g. perceptions that younger and/or unmarried female staff are sexually available, perceptions that how women dress makes them sexually available) Lack of understanding of UN personnel as to what behaviour constitutes sexual harassment Sense of impunity among UN personnel Weak tone at the top from leadership, managers and commanders about the importance of addressing prohibited conduct under ST/SGB/2008/5, which results in a permissive environment for such misconduct to occur Poor gender balance Working and living in UN compounds in Mission A leads to a blurring of private and professional lives and contributes to inappropriate behaviour targeted at international female staff in particular Excessive drinking at Mission A's social centres contributes to inappropriate behaviour targeted at international female staff 	All, but particularly Mission A and Mission B	Likely (3)	Significant (4)	Limited improvement needed (4)	Very High	1. Introduction of new, tailored awareness-raising materials on these forms of misconduct. 2. Head of Mission to hold regular meetings with senior managers in Missions A and B to emphasize their accountability for addressing conduct and discipline issues in their offices, including sexual harassment and other forms of prohibited conduct under ST/SGB/2008/5; 3. Introduce new gender-awareness training to address discriminatory attitudes about women in the workplace in Mission A	1. RCDU. 2. Office of the SRSG Mission A and Office of the SRSG Mission B. 3. Gender Section, Mission A	1. By end quarter 2; 2. Quarter 2 and 4. 3. Quarter 2.

Workplan Outcome	Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)	Risk response	Action owner (Mission(s))	Due date
	2	Abuse of authority and harassment (as per ST/SGB/2008/5) by international and national civilians against other civilians, resulting in psychological and other harm, security threats to victims and perpetrators, a toxic work environment, lower staff morale, higher staff absenteeism and illness, higher staff turnover and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission/Office [Priority]	[...]	All	Likely (3)	Moderate (2)	Limited improvement needed (4)	Very High	[...]	[...]	[...]
	3	SEA: Sexual exploitation and abuse of contracted cleaners by UN international civilians in UN-provided accommodation in Mission A and Mission B , resulting in harm to victims (psychological, physical, social), possible arrest and detention for adultery or homosexuality, security threats to the victim or perpetrator, the risk of transmission of HIV and/or STDs, and damage to the reputation and credibility of the UN Field Mission [Priority]	[...]	Mission A, Mission B	Rare (1)	Significant (4)	Limited improvement needed (4)	High	[...]	[...]	[...]

Workplan Outcome	Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)	Risk response	Action owner (Mission(s))	Due date
	4	Entitlement fraud (e.g. false medical insurance claims) and falsification of PHPs among national staff, resulting in financial loss and reputational damage to the UN Field Mission	[...]	Mission A, Mission B	Highly likely (4)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate	1. Introduce new form to declare family relationships during recruitment process for national staff in Missions A and B	1. Chief of Mission Support and Chief of Human Resources in Missions A and B	1. Q1
	5	Petty theft in UN offices and UN residential compounds, resulting in financial loss to the UN Field Mission/Office as well as personal loss to UN staff	[...]	Mission A, Mission B, Mission C	Likely (3)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate	[...]	[...]	[...]
Risks to Outcome 2 (Enforcement)	6	Victims of sexual harassment in the workplace (particularly female staff) and those who witness it do not report allegations , resulting in low detection of sexual harassment, impunity for perpetrators, victims not receiving assistance and a toxic work environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear of retaliation for reporting sexual harassment from families and relatives (physical violence, social ostracism, murder (so-called honour killings)), particularly among female personnel; • Fear of retaliation from peers and supervisors; • Lack of trust, particularly among female staff, in the UN complaints mechanisms and its ability to maintain confidentiality; • Staff on insecure contracts fear that their contracts will not be renewed if they report sexual harassment and other forms of misconduct. 	Mission A in particular and Mission B	Highly likely (4)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate	1. Establish new reporting mechanisms on sexual harassment in Mission A that young, female national staff feel safe to use	1. RCDU	1. Q1

Workplan Outcome	Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)	Risk response	Action owner (Mission(s))	Due date
	7	Contracted cleaners and the local population do not report allegations of SEA by international civilians in UN compounds in Missions A and B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of awareness of the population on UN standards of conduct on SEA and how to report SEA; • Victims and/or relatives are financially depending on UN personnel and fear loss of income if they report SEA; • Fear of retaliation for reporting SEA from families and relatives (physical violence, social ostracism); • Fear of legal consequences for reporting SEA (e.g. arrest for adultery); • Lack of trust in UN complaints mechanisms and its ability to maintain confidentiality. 	Mission A, Mission B	Highly likely (4)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate	[...]	[...]	[...]
	8	UN personnel do not report allegations of misconduct , resulting in low detection of misconduct, impunity for perpetrators and victims not receiving assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear of retaliation by perpetrators or others; • Cultural tolerance or acceptance for certain forms of misconduct (e.g. sexual harassment or discrimination against female staff); • Lack of trust in UN complaints mechanisms and its ability to maintain confidentiality; • Strong sense of camaraderie among certain groups of UN personnel, which discourages reporting against each other; • Low number of female national staff in senior positions reduces the likelihood of female national staff in Mission A reporting prohibited conduct under ST/SGB/2008/5 through supervisory channels; • Staff on insecure contracts fear that their contracts will not be renewed if they report sexual harassment and other forms of misconduct 	All, particularly Mission A and Mission B	Likely (3)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate	1. Issue broadcast reminders from the Head of Mission to staff about their duty to report misconduct; 2. Conduct awareness raising on the UN's whistle-blower policy; 3. Establish a new, confidential reporting channel for allegations of misconduct straight to the DRSR/RC/HC in Mission A.	1. PIO and RCDU; 2. PIO and RCDU; 3. Office of the DSRSG/RC/HC in Mission A	1. Once per quarter. 2. Q1 and Q3. 3. Q2

Workplan Outcome	Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)	Risk response	Action owner (Mission(s))	Due date
	9	Low commitment of incoming or existing leadership, management and commanders to addressing misconduct, which results in actual or perceived impunity and frequent escalation of low-level incidents into misconduct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low levels of awareness among incoming/new leadership, management and commanders about what constitutes misconduct and the importance of addressing it; • Weak skills of managers and supervisors to address and resolve inter-personal conflict before it escalates into misconduct; • Weak tone from leadership about the importance of tackling misconduct 	All	Unlikely (2)	Moderate (2)	Effective (5)	Low	[...]	[...]	[...]
	10	Misconduct allegations are not properly investigated by the Mission , resulting in harm to victims, impunity for perpetrators, a perception of a UN cover-up, mistrust in the UN's internal disciplinary system and reputational damage to the Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allegations are not reported in a timely manner resulting in evidence being unavailable or difficult to authenticate; • Witnesses feel intimidated and refuse to cooperate with the investigation; • Military personnel rotate out before they can be interviewed; • Not all panel members have been trained resulting in a poor quality investigation; • Poor quality interviewing techniques of Mission investigators compromises the Organization's ability to take appropriate administrative or disciplinary action. 	All	Likely (3)	High (3)	Limited improvement needed (4)	Moderate	[...]	[...]	[...]

Workplan Outcome	Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	Mission(s)/ Office affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)	Risk response	Action owner (Mission(s))	Due date
	11	Misconduct cases take longer than the prescribed time to complete , resulting in further distress and trauma to victims, a perception of impunity for perpetrators, reduced willingness to report misconduct, distrust in the effectiveness of the UN's internal disciplinary system, and a perception of a UN cover-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty in tracing witnesses; • Investigation reports that are of poor quality are returned with a request for investigators to gather more evidence; • For investigations into violations of ST/SGB/2008/5, panel members are not available in a timely way. 	All	Likely (3)	High (3)	Limited improvement needed (4)	Moderate	1. Provide briefings for Mission investigators on report writing.	1. RCDU	1. Q1 and Q3.
Risks to Outcome 3	12	Victims of sexual harassment do not take up UN offer of assistance , resulting in continued psychological harm to victims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victims are unwilling to receive counselling offered by the UN out of fear of being identified as a victim and resulting fear of retaliation from relatives. 	Mission A, Mission B	Likely (3)	Critical - 5	Limited improvement needed (4)	High	1. Identify discrete ways for victims of sexual harassment to access UN counselling support in Mission A and B.	1. Counselling Service and RCDU	1. Q1

Tool 6. Template for a Misconduct Workplan Logframe

Logframe for the SEA/Misconduct Workplan for [UN entity] (start and end date)

Impact/objective: To support the effective mandate implementation in [UN entity] through a workplan addressing all forms of misconduct, including sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA)

Outcome 1 (Prevention): Acts of misconduct by UN personnel are prevented

Outputs (key deliverables)	Key activities	Office/unit	Status (comment)
Output 1: xxx	1.1 ...		
	1.2 ...		
Output 2: xxx	2.1....		
....			

Outcome 2 (Enforcement): UN standards of conduct are enforced when misconduct occurs

Outputs (key deliverables)	Key activities	Office/unit	Status (comment)
Output x: xxx			
...	...		

Outcome 3 (Victim Assistance): Victims of misconduct by UN personnel are assisted

Outputs (key deliverables)	Key activities	Office/unit	Status (comment)
Output xx: xxx			

Information as of [date]

Status	Explanations
	Green = on schedule
	Amber = potential for delays
	Red = no progress/significantly behind schedule
	Blue = completed

Tool 7. SEA/Misconduct Risk Register for [UN entity] (start and end date)

Risk ID	Risk and its consequence(s)	Risk factors (causes of the risk)	UN Entity/Offices Affected	Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk (after internal controls)	Risk response	Action owner (office/unit)	Due date
1										
2										
3										

Drop-down menu:

Likelihood	Impact	Effectiveness internal controls	Severity residual risk
Imminent (5)	Critical - 5	Effective (5)	Very High
Highly likely (4)	Significant (4)	Limited improvement needed (4)	High
Likely (3)	High (3)	Significant improvement needed (3)	Moderate
Unlikely (2)	Moderate (2)	Ineffective (2)	Low
Rare (1)	Low (1)	Highly ineffective (1)	

