REDR UK

eisf

REPORT: INCLUSION AND SECURITY OF LGBTI AID WORKERS

WORKSHOP 22/01/2016

Photograph: David Poller/ZUMA Press/Corbis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF THE REPORT

> 'Sex with someone of the same sex is illegal in 75 countries, and punishable by death in ten. That means 40 per cent of the world's population live in countries where gay, lesbian and bisexual people can be imprisoned, just for being themselves. Over 400 million people live under laws which punish same-sex sex with the death penalty.'
>
> - Stonewall International Research, 2016

RedR UK and EISF hosted a workshop on Friday 22nd January 2016, exploring current practices and issues that international development and humanitarian organisations' encounter when approaching the inclusion and security of both international and national LGBTI aid workers[1]. The need for this workshop arose from the lack of current discussion on these topics, as well as the wide-scale lack of adequate polices or best practices in ensuring the inclusion and security of workers within the humanitarian and development sectors. Related to this is the huge lack of available data on the experiences of LGBTI aid workers, including; regional and country data on the number of aid workers identifying as LGBTI, any correlation or trends between identifying as LGBTI and the type and frequency of security incidents, and documented incidents of labour discrimination related to LGBTI workers. Although imperfect, LGBTI staff based in HQ may find their rights are better respected than their colleagues working or deployed at field level. As a result, the workshop focused on the latter, and the need for comprehensive policies and practices for all NGO staff members, not only those who enjoy domestic norms and laws which reinforce their rights'

It is noted that the LGBTI identity issues are extremely closely related, and it can be argued inseparable, from gender identities. This has an impact on both the self-identity of LGBTI persons, and the gender assumptions made by others (e.g. colleagues, beneficiaries, and friends). An example of this could be that the manager of a gay aid worker advises them to 'try and pass as straight' (assuming 'straight' entails demonstrating 'masculine' traits) whilst on a particular work mission/deployment or in a certain context.

The workshop invited a range of stakeholders from the humanitarian and private sector, with expertise in aid worker's safety and security, HR and

---

[1] Please note that many of the experiences, concerns and recommendations apply to both development and humanitarian actors.

inclusion, and staff wellbeing. A representative of faith based aid work participated to share experiences from religiously motivated organisations. In recognising that the private sector is ahead of the humanitarian sector in terms of LGBTI staff inclusion, we invited forerunners - [Stonewall]() and [Mott MacDonald]() - who provided useful examples of best practice in terms of HR inclusion and organisational culture and attitudes. They also provided examples of best practice in deploying private sector staff to international offices, in contexts which are hostile to LGBTI identities. 21 participants attended the day. Upon the participants' request, we have not included a list of attendees.

Overall, the workshop aimed to:

i) Explore the experiences of LBGTI humanitarian field workers and organisations, through expert speakers, participants' experiences and case studies, in order to understand and capture the challenges faced in operating as an LGBTI aid worker.
ii) Hear from international private sector firms, which have successfully integrated LGBTI inclusion into their organisational policies and practices, in order to look at ways the humanitarian and development sectors can adopted or adapt such practices in their work and organisational identities.

Note: LGBTI stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender/Transsexual and Intersexed. We are aware that the term SOGI, standing for 'Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity' is frequently used, but chose to define the issues explored in the workshop and in this report, under the definition of 'LGBTI.' Whilst we recognise that semantics have an important part to play in LGBTI or SOGI debates and issues, this is not the focus of our workshop or research. The organisers of the event recognise that the categorisation of people into LGBTI has complexity and limitation with regard to identity and sexuality. However, for the purpose of this report and this workshop the phrase LGBTI will be used with the understanding that we are referring to a wide range of sexual orientation and gender identities beyond that of LGBTI.

Workshop Limitations:

1) We had a range of participants from humanitarian, development, academic and private sector institutions. However, all participants were either UK-based workers or 'International' workers, being deployed from UK, American or Western European states to humanitarian or development contexts in other countries. No one represented a 'national' member of humanitarian staff. In the HR discussions we particularly focused on the issue of deploying international staff into humanitarian field locations, but not around the recruitment and HR

inclusion and support of national LGBTI staff. We were therefore limited in so far as we did not have any national voices or experiences represented in the workshop. However, it is noted that a number of the case studies featured examples of national workers experiencing discrimination or security issues within their countries of operation.

2) Of the four expert speakers, we did not have a 'female' represented, nor did we have the experiences of a lesbian, transsexual/transgender or Intersexed person. Participants however represented a fuller spectrum of LGBTI identities and different experiences were bought up in group discussions. It is further noted that the case studies covered the experiences of lesbian, gay and transgendered aid workers.

3) Intersexed worker's experiences and voices were untouched in the workshop, and this is an area of improvement to note for future discussions and research.

SECTION 2. OUTLINE OF THE DAY

Speakers

Kit Dorey, International Policy Officer, Stonewall
Kit Dorey of [Stonewall](#) spoke about the international picture for LGBTI individuals. Stonewall is a UK-based charity which advocates and campaigns for LGBTI rights and trains LGBTI human rights defenders. Stonewall equips people with the tools and confidence to connect with, influence and enable others in their communities, by challenging homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying, celebrating difference and improving inclusion. Stonewall has undertaken research into 6 keys areas: Health, Work, Sport, Education, Hate Crime and the International Picture. Kit touched on international research that Stonewall has recently (2016) conducted as well as UK employment and labour research that stonewall collects which may be relevant or adaptable to the humanitarian sector.

Ryan Delafosse, LGBT Aid and Development Workers
Ryan set up the [LGBT Aid and Development Workers website](#) in 2014, as well as [blogging](#) on his experiences as a gay aid worker. Ryan provided a

personal perspective on working in Jordan for an International NGO[2], detailing a number of HR and security incidents that he encountered or had witnessed take place to LGBTI colleagues. The main challenges he discussed were: lack of adequate HR support, lack of information and resources before and during deployment and feelings of stress and isolation.

Richard Chapman-Harris, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager, Mott MacDonald

Mott MacDonald, a corporate supporter of RedR UK, is a global management, engineering and development consultancy firm which works in 150 countries, with 180 offices and over 16,000 members of staff worldwide. Richard discussed number of Equality and Diversity policies and initiatives he had implemented in the company, providing information on who to engage with, time-frame and resources needed. He also drew from previous experience as an equality and diversity officer in the UK police force and gave examples of staff trainings and initiatives he engaged with in that role.

James Davis, Safety and Security Coordinator, ACT Alliance

ACT Alliance is a coalition of 139 churches and faith-based organisations working together in over 100 countries to create positive and sustainable change in the lives of poor and marginalised people regardless of their religion, politics, gender, sexual orientation, race or nationality in keeping with the highest international codes and standards. ACT Alliance is supported by 25,000 staff from member organisations and mobilises about $1.5 billion for its work each year in three targeted areas:

- humanitarian aid
- development
- advocacy

James discussed a gender and sexuality training that he conducted for ACT alliance members in Bangkok. He covered issues around engaging faith based organisations' in LGBTI discussions, with a focus on how to engage national staff from regions where they may not have been exposed to LGBTI issues, or here LGBTI discussions are taboo.

2.1 THE INTERNATIONAL PICTURE FOR LGBTI AID WORKERS - KIT DOREY, STONEWALL

---

[2] Not named to protect its identity

Kit Dorey of Stonewall delivering his presentation on 'The international picture for LGBTI aid workers'

- There has been notable progress on LGBTI rights over the past 25 years. Since 1990, 40 countries have decriminalised homosexuality and over 30 have outlawed homophobic hate crimes. As of 2015, over 60 countries legally protect LGBTI people at work and 15 recognise same-sex marriage. However, huge challenges remain, and sex with someone of the **same sex is illegal in 76 countries (see: full map in Annex III)**, and punishable by death in ten. That means 40 per cent of the world's population live in countries where gay, lesbian and bisexual people can be imprisoned. Over 400 million people live under laws which punish same-sex sex with the death penalty.

- There needs to be a comprehensive organisational acknowledgement that LGBTI aid workers face **additional challenges and stress (including; discrimination, hate crime, lack of partnership opportunities, lack of openness, family separation, lack of appropriate health care)** to their colleagues in some contexts, requiring enhanced support and protection to ensure their productivity and wellbeing. Aside from the basic safety and security aspect, there is a business case to be made as it has been proven that organisations with comprehensive and supportive policies benefit from happier and more positive staff attitudes, better staff retention and an overall better team atmosphere which fosters productivity.

- Organisations should have **global policies and practices in place**. There should be clear and communicated anti-bullying and anti-harassment rules for all staff, and staff should be aware of the policies that will support them during their work, particularly around issues such as relocation. Support before, during and after deployment is key, and in this there are concrete areas where the policies and practice of organisations must be improved. Organisations should, for example,

provide **sector and context specific advice** on the local environment and what can be expected. This includes explicit inclusion in policies and protocols, for example rural evacuations.

- Experience has shown that **LGBTI Staff Network Groups** are an effective mechanism for building sustainable support structures and fostering a more inclusive environment, particularly when empowered with time and resources from the organisation. Not only can these networks counteract the isolation that is felt by many aid workers, arguably more acutely for those who identify as LGBTI, but it creates an opportunity to establish a collective voice to address gaps in the organisation's policies and procedures. For example, the Proud 2 Serve network has proven to be a useful tool for LGBT military personnel and their families to provide support, share information and facilitate networking. Another strategy, used widely in the private sector, is the Diversity Champion Programmeme. This can be extremely effective as it shows career trajectory and progression opportunities.

- The **lack of statistics** regarding attacks on LGBTI aid workers was highlighted as an issue. Stonewall is producing new literature in 2016 on monitoring, to highlight best practice on collection of information on staff profiles. Stonewall also have resources and can help with digital monitoring within organisations. If organisations don't have any data, they can begin to integrate questions on profiles generally through staff surveys for diversity and inclusion. However, it should be noted that where an individual doesn't feel comfortable in an organisation, then they are not going to share their LGBTI identity, (anonymously or otherwise). Even without data, organisations have to assume there are staff who need support.

2.2 A GAY AID WORKER'S INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCE AND ACTION - RYAN DELAFOSSE, LGBT AID AND DEVELOPMENT WORKERS

Ryan gave his personal reflections on inclusion through experience and suggestion. His main areas of focus are summarised below:

- Ryan gave the example of a senior manager seeking his advice (whilst he was a very junior member of the team) on how to deal with a national staff member who was being ostracised by colleagues as they

thought he was gay. Feeling supported and valued by the organisation is a crucial comfort to those who may be more vulnerable to feelings of isolation and loneliness. For those who identify as LGBTI, these feelings can be compounded by their uncertainty or inability to come out to their local friends and colleagues, particularly when moving around a lot. This can also produce a tension where country staff may be aware of an individual's status, but local staff might not.

- There are several stages to improving organisational policy on LGBTI aid workers. The first would involve starting to have **conversations** on what it means to identify as LGBTI in some environments and how to avoid putting oneself at additional risk. The inclusion of simple dos and don'ts, such as not using dating apps, can significantly reduce the likelihood of an incident. These conversations can be uncomfortable in some countries as they bring up awkward questions of cultural differences, however while real discrimination is occurring they are absolutely necessary. Reducing communication barriers and fostering conversation can reduce instances of blackmail and entrapment, which are not rare occurrences.

- Some larger organisations have policies that create **inconsistencies** across national borders. For example, a same-sex couple that are married in certain US states could receive benefits and recognition whereas those in other countries do not. The WFP have a policy of recognising a marriage and allocating benefits accordingly even where the union is not recognised in the home country.

- Individuals can use **LGBTI networks** and try to get in contact with someone else in the local area who understands the situation they are in. This can be a huge comfort and reassurance as it can stop the staff member from feeling alone.

2.3 A PRIVATE SECTOR APPROACH TO EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY - RICHARD CHAPMAN HARRIS, MOTT MACDONALD

- Inviting private sector representatives to this discussion was extremely valuable as they provided some useful examples of successful inclusion policies and practices, from the perspective of globally operational organisations that work with a diverse range of staff and

partners. In addition, many have managed to implement these policies from offices in countries where homosexuality is illegal/stigmatised. However, there are a number of limitations in applying the private sector experience to the humanitarian one, especially in terms of humanitarian organisations' aiming to borrow policies and practices from privately run companies. The first limitation is the disparity in resources between the 'average' private and humanitarian agencies[3]. The majority of INGOS/NGOs have limited funding to invest in HR functions, and would be unable to implement the scale and quality of initiatives carried out by private sector agencies. We were given examples of private sector initiatives such as a whistleblowing hot desk run by an external provider for all staff, and compulsory Equality and Diversity training for all senior managers. However, this level of support and training is not a reality for many humanitarian agencies (especially small local or national NGOs) that run on limited funds. It is also worth noting that humanitarian organisation's priorities are, to a considerable degree, determined by the strategic priorities of donors. Therefore, a good place to start in terms of building the inclusion capacities of humanitarian organisations is to lobby for support from relevant humanitarian donors. Furthermore, there is a generally a disparity in the speed at which operations are conducted by humanitarian and private sector agencies. Humanitarian agencies are often moving from emergency response to emergency response, with little 'down time' to invest in issues such as staff learning and development and capacity building. Longer term initiatives relating to staff inclusion often falls to the bottom of agencies' priorities as staff struggle to respond to immediate crises. Finding the 'appropriate time' to implement inclusion initiatives can be difficult. With staff working remotely and travelling in and out of regions, it can be hard to get the consistency you need to meaningfully implement these initiatives or conduct relevant trainings for staff. This is compounded by the high turnover and high levels of stress commonly found in staff working for humanitarian agencies.

- Mott MacDonald is a global engineering management and consultancy firm with 16,000 staff members globally working in most countries; Mott MacDonald's main focus is on infrastructure, bridges, power stations, sustainability consulting, international development work on health and education. They provide staff with security briefings and training (e-learning) and, rather than providing specific training for female staff, they are integrating a gendered perspective into all trainings.

---

[3] There will of course be exceptions with very large multi- national INGOs such as Save the Children or Medicines San Frontiers or UN agencies.

- Mott MacDonald have an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) network called 'Advance', which is led by the organisation's chairman but is managed by staff. Staff are given paid time to undertake this kind of work. Where possible, try to negotiate some formal recognition of a network (time, budget) for staff working on incorporating LGBTI policies. It was further mentioned that staff involvement in EDI networks is included in performance and development review. This makes it easier to manage the performance; encourages cultural change through the use of the budget and clear objectives. 10 regional champions with a half-day of payment per month to dedicate to the network.

- Mott MacDonald have a global vulnerability management team, providing regular briefings to staff who are due to be posted abroad. The challenge here is that there is no robust process in place to discuss LGBTI issues, and there is a need for all training materials and the e-learning package to be updated to include LGBTI issues. LGBTI (or disability, or racial diversity) issues should be embedded within all existing policy packages, rather than creating something that is remedial or palliative for diverse groups. Organisations should think about how they can alter the existing structure, rather than creating new policies. Give people a personal experience of unfairness – this gives people a good personal experience of what this is like and opens them up to different ways of thinking.

- Coaching and mentoring is recommended to do internally - unconscious bias training as an intervention. 1-1 unconscious bias coaching with each of the participants, the embedding and follow-up is key. Important that individuals map out their own unconscious bias and see how it impacts their team, their colleagues or their personal life. Personally understanding what is being experienced by others in the workplace and examining how they can fix that is key. 'LGBTI' can sometimes be a barrier, as most organisations' senior management teams are disproportionally composed of older white men, and the way that we socialise maleness is often at the expense of the 'other', e.g. LGBTI person. Getting people to engage without feeling that they are sacrificing some of their 'maleness' is key. This process is also quite unifying as we all have bias', and doing this makes us get the best from our colleagues.

- If you cannot get your employee engagement & HR policies in place at HQ level, it will not map out into the field. Guidance for private sector may be much different to the aid sector as NGOs might engage more closely with their communities.

- Can ethics policies be changed to include sexual orientation and gender identity, so if an employee, irrespective of location, harasses another member of staff, it can be dealt with via the employee bullying and harassment policy?

- It is important to ensure EDI person has the power to make a difference - it shouldn't be a tokenistic role, and this requires a real investment.

- Need to have quantifiable evidence to show the gaps are and map out clear goals to fill those gaps – otherwise, in championing this, people might be seen as 'troublemakers'.

2.4 CREATING A DIALOGUE: A GENDER AND SECURITY WORKSHOP FOR FAITH-BASED ORGANISATIONS - JAMES DAVIS, ACT ALLIANCE

James Davis of the ACT Alliance delivering his talk on Gender and security for faith-based organisations

A summary of James Davis' presentation is as follows:

- In 2015, the ACT Alliance created a new gender policy that didn't include LGBTI considerations, except for a token line regarding people withdrawing from uncomfortable conversations. As James Davis is **employed externally** by all the ACT Alliance members, he is in a unique position to be able to highlight areas around LGBTI security that internal employees might not feel equipped to bring up.

- An LGBTI Security workshop event was organised by the ACT Alliance in Bangkok, involving national staff from different country offices. When asked to speak about LGBTI issues, most participants focused on women's issues, save for one individual who addressed LGBTI issues. James countered this women-focused discussion with topics including the risk to men. It was highlighted that males encounter more combatant and violence–related issues, whilst women have more intimidation and harassment issues or incidents.

- Some faith-based organisations wouldn't engage on LGBTI issues or with LGBTI people because they wouldn't hire them for religious reasons. Some organisation's staff were genuinely unaware of what it means to be transgender or transsexual.

- How do you get a Christian alliance of NGOs interested in talking about these issues? This issue is also relevant to networks of other faiths. Bringing LGBTI people to the workshop made it a much more human debate and conversation, and really questioning people about who they think deserves human rights and why is key. It was important to be flexible – when not set in absolute stone, there are opportunities to explore different elements or considerations within faith.

- Who facilitates the workshop? In what context do partners become involved? Who delivers the service with legitimacy? In terms of gender balance for training delivery, ideally there would be male and female facilitators with experience in sexual harassment, however, in this instance, the white male ex-military perspective can be more relatable and accessible for some. This is obviously the case for certain western categories of international staff, however in training national staff, a person from their region who can discuss LGBTI issues in a culturally appropriate way, would be beneficial.

SECTION 3. ORGANISATIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITIES, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES - FINDINGS FROM THE SCOPING EXERCISE

During the afternoon session of the workshop, participants were divided into groups and were assigned a vignette (please see Annex I) which aimed to replicate some of the security and inclusion-related issues that aid organisations might encounter when managing staff with diverse gender identity or sexuality profiles. The groups were asked to discuss the issues they identified in the vignette and feedback to the workshop participants.

As a summary, the main findings from the scoping exercise were as follows:

a) There is a lack of recognition from INGOs that LGBTI people exist within their workforce.

b) Policies have not been developed to protect the rights of these employees. This is particularly significant because rights for LGBTI people vary so significantly around the world and INGOs by their very nature are international organisations which have to negotiate these borders. The lack of recognition and subsequent lack of policy means that;

c) Individual aid workers and individual security/HR/country managers end up making decisions about 'what is right/possible/safe', without relevant knowledge or training on how to make decisions relating to LGBTI workers' safety and opportunities. This leads to enormous inequality within the field and insecurity for LGBTI aid workers. LGBTI aid workers end up relying on the 'goodwill' of their colleagues to act in the best interests of all.

What also came out of these discussion is that, one size doesn't fit all, as there are substantial differences between NGOs policies and practices. With INGOs and NGOs from all over the world, the labour laws and HR policies they adopt will be vastly different and will in part depend on the labour laws in the country in which they are established. In addition, the ethos of the organisation will also play a role, i.e. faith-based organisations, as well as

their commitment to, and available resources for HR and staff wellbeing. We understand that there cannot be an entirely universal approach to these issues as they are very context specific. That being said there are still some recommendations and common principles of inclusion and diversity that all organisations can follow.

Below are some of the issues and questions raised by the groups when exploring the vignettes. The discussions have been split into experiences and recommendations. Please note that not all experiences have a corresponding recommendation.

3.1 POLICIES, DECISION-MAKING AND INFORMATION-SHARING

Experiences	Recommendations
It was commonplace for NGOs to have **reactive instead of proactive policies** regarding LGBTI staff security. Examples include: writing an annex to a staff handbook after a serious security incident is experienced by and LGBT or I staff member, creating a policy or precedent on same sex housing arrangements after a request from an openly LGBTI member of staff, evacuating or moving and LGBTI member of staff under threat of a security incident.	Participants identified the need for 'lightly-phrased' **policies**, which are both broad in their remit and overarching, and considerate to both national and international staff's needs. The use of other policies (not necessarily LGBTI focused) to develop LGBTI awareness was cited as a possibility, as broader policies can be used in any context/situation, irrespective of gender or sexuality.
Participants questioned who in organisations gives **support to the decision-makers**? Do they make decisions alone based on their interpretation of organisational policy or are there other people involved?	For organisations to clarify where LGBTI inclusion issues fits into: - Staff security - Recruitment - Health and well being And, where LGBTI is a factor in these decisions, there should be guidance on:

	- Which documents to refer to; - Who needs to be consulted and involved in the decision (including sign off levels).
A **lack of resources** (including; pre-deployment briefings, new started handbooks or organisational inductions, LGBTI-focused health care policy, housing policy, R and R policies) or information given to the individual staff member means it is more difficult for them to make informed choices regarding a mission, piece of work or a deployment.	Information on these areas should be given to all staff members in the resource pack, it therefore negates the need for anyone to reveal their sexual orientation to the organisation. It shows the organisation's approach and support on the issues and means that all staff are aware and can make informed choices

3.2 CULTURE AND AWARENESS

Experiences	Recommendations
Participants felt that strong levels of **presumption and bias** existed where decisions needed to be made concerning LGBTI staff. Examples of presumption: we assume that a lesbian worker would not want to go to Kabul with her partner; we assume that a national aid worker would not want to be openly gay in their office, we assume that a transsexual person would not apply for a role in South Sudan.	Participants felt that a **supportive, enabling organisational ethos and culture** is extremely important in humanitarian and development workplace. It is noted that organisational culture is different from local culture, and whilst agencies may not be able to significantly change local cultural contexts, inclusive organisational culture forms and important factor in LGBTI worker's feeling of safety and belonging in the work-place.
	Strong mechanism for addressing concerns or complaints and

	managers with a dedicated remit to care for staff were suggested ways in which organisations can change the organisational culture for international, national and local staff.
Poor or no response to staff issues is seen as common in humanitarian action. Individuals often feel bad for taking up the time of a line manager who is very busy, especially in emergency response. This is a cultural issue that needs to change.	The **contextual culture** must always be considered, and this can be difficult to address, particularly where it is culturally acceptable to be very blunt. An attitudinal shift in the sector which values the individuals providing aid and recognises their needs and dignity are also at the core of the response needs to take place. Creation of staff council mechanisms as alternative point of contact for raising issues discreetly.

3.3 HUMAN RESOURCES

3.3.1 Recruitment and Deployment - HR Considerations

Experiences	Recommendations
Understaffing and under-resourced programmemes can be an issue, as staff feel that it is necessary to take particular roles to fill a gap, when they might not be comfortable working in that country or context.	Organisations need to have **clear recruitment policies** which are explained to recruiting managers and are actively conveyed to applicants.

3.3.2 Health and Wellbeing (incl. R&R)

Experiences	Recommendations
Training for human resources staff is often focused on recruitment and dismissal, not on how to address staff issues or problems.	**Mental health and wellbeing policies** need to be in place to support all staff, irrespective of whether they are LGBT or I.
Within the HR role, staff sometimes feel that they cannot ask people about certain questions directly; what could be a full and frank conversation becomes something very different (perhaps uninformative) when HR managers are trying to be so sensitive or careful around issues	Health and wellbeing was raised as an issue which must be focused on by **the individual as well as the organisation**.
	Participant raised that this focus of training on recruitment and dismissal should be inclusive to also focus on staff issues or problems.
	HR managers should be trained in how to deal with issues specific to LGBTI staff.
	Clear policies on R&R, including whether partners or others can visit staff, the level of care or support a staff member might expect to receive in the place they take their R&R should be established and conveyed to employees.

3.3.3 Training, Whistleblowing, and Complaints-Handling

Experiences	Recommendations
Staff inductions and trainings were cited as being key in equipping staff and teams to respond well to issues, e.g. bullying.	Diversity and inclusion training given to managers to cascade through teams. Contextualised training for national staff.
Security managers can explain the implications of certain behaviours to teams, linking training to the consequences of actions when in the field.	Many online courses give an introduction to EOD which could be a part of a mandatory induction for staff.

3.3.4 HR inclusion and diversity policies (incl. anti-bullying)

Experiences	Recommendations
Many organisations have not been able to find the resources or expertise to develop specific policies on LGBTI inclusion, but have been able to use anti-bullying and staff welfare policies in their place.	Something as simple as an email being sent to the whole organisations, letting them know that bullying and harassment won't be tolerated, and that this includes LGBTI discrimination, can show staff an organisation's position on the issue of LGBTI staff and give LGBTI staff a course of action if bullying does take place. Stonewall has created a range of resources to support HR departments and line managers with LGBTI inclusion in the workplace.

3.4 SECURITY FOR LGBTI AID WORKERS

3.4.1 Recruitment and Deployment - Security Considerations

Experiences	Recommendations
Many security managers/line managers of LGBT or I staff make assumptions (often wrongly) that a staff member wouldn't be willing or wouldn't be able to take up a certain posting on the basis of their identity. They often make this assumption without checking with the staff member concerned, which excludes them from the process. This was particularly mentioned in the context of staff security- it is often assumed that a situation would be too dangerous for an LGBT or I worker without a full and thorough analysis of the situation being conducted (including seeking input from LGBT or I workers that may be working in a similar context)	Security risk management should be **an enabler** for the best applicant to take a role in a particular context.
	Where a staff member feels that they cannot take a job or a posting due to their sexuality or gender identity, it should be made clear to them that there **are no negative repercussions** from inability to take the job and that an alternative will be sought to ensure their career progression. Many organisations would need to develop specific policy around this if they currently have policies that restrict staff from turning down field missions, if the organisation has assumed or assessed that it is safe for them to be deployed. For there to be available LGBTI networks or focal points across a range of contexts that can be called on/act as a resource to feed into humanitarian organisation's security analysis for LGBTI staff.

3.4.2 Organisational Risk Appetite

Experiences	Recommendations
Security managers often make assumptions on what risks a particular context will raise for an LGBTI worker, without conducting a	The organisational risk appetite needs to be firmly established. Is the organsiation fulfilling its duty of care to the individual, the programmeme

full analysis. Security decisions are often made without including the opinion of or informing the LGBTI member of staff concerned about the process of security analysis Very few organisations have formalized processes for dealing with risk assessments relating to LGBTI factors or issues. Very few organisations have precedents or standards for dealing with LGBTI as an issue for consideration in security and deployment assessments	team and the beneficiaries? A large determiner of an Organisation's Risk Appetite is the approach of the Security Manager or Focal Point and the methods by which they conduct organisational and situational needs assessment. Does the Security Manager assume that a situation will be a certain way without fully analysing the context and speaking to a range of staff and stakeholders? Importantly, does the security team speak with the LGBTI member of staff? Do they conduct their assessments in collabouration with staff and take into account their Risk Appetite and feelings about an assignment.
	Has the organisation's reputational, as well as the physical or other risk, been taken into account? How can any issues be mitigated against?

3.4.3 Perceived versus Actual Risk

Experiences	Recommendations
Is the business of the organisation actually going to be compromised if an LGBTI staff member takes a certain job, e.g. via reputational difficulties, issues with local government, engagement with other organisations/ donors if a person with an LGBTI profile takes a role? What is the evidence for this? This links to one of the major gaps in terms of LGBTI inclusion in the	Proper **risk profiling** must be undertaken, and staff must be trained in how to deliver this information well to colleagues. This links back to LGBTI needing to be a 'category' or 'theme' of security assessments and processes. Otherwise it's likely to fall back on guess work or individual perspective. The deployment of LGBTI staff may

Experiences	Recommendations
sector, which is the lack of data collection on security incidents linked to LGBTI profiles.	be able to help and positively affect beneficiaries who identify as LGBTI; Promoting inclusive equality in an organisation can also promote a wider acceptance and human rights approach externally.

3.4.4 Management of Security Incidents

Experiences	Recommendations
Humanitarian organisations lack policies on what to do should an incident happen to an LGBTI member of staff, e.g. are there family issues regarding next of kin which should be considered?	For organisations to adapt existing, or create new guidance relating to managing incidents that are directed at LGBTI staff, Examples of how policies can be adapted; are there family issues regarding next of kin which should be considered? How about risks in reporting to the police or official services in certain contexts? What about specialized medical services or counselling needed in cases of SBGV. ***It is worth noting here that agencies should explore the** nature of any incident, and whether this is as a result of LGBTI status, not just whether an LGBT or I staff member was affected by the incident. For example, a gay aid worker may suffer from pretty theft, which is not targeted at their sexuality. However, a homophobic hate crime would be a different matter.

3.4.5 Incident Reporting (incl. statistics)

Experiences	Recommendations
There is very little to no (consistent) data collected or published on the number, frequency and type of security incidents involving LGBTI aid workers/motivated by gender identity and sexuality. Anecdotal evidence is sparse, not well verified or collated. The Aid Worker Security Database (AWSD), collects and publishes data on aid worker security incidents. It disaggregates data by gender (male/female), but not by any other sex or sexuality classifications. We do not know if other humanitarian networks or agencies are collecting LGBTI security incident data.	It is recommended that a survey of stakeholders- INGOs, NGOs, donors, UN and security networks and providers- is undertaken, to examine how many collect LGBTI data in relation to security incidents. It's important that organisations encourage LGBTI workers to report incidents, so that they do not feel their identity is exposed (anonymous reporting) and they do not feel a burden to the organisation and its programmeme delivery.

3.5 INTERNATIONAL STAFF AND NATIONAL STAFF

3.5.1 Challenges and Opportunities for National Staff and International Staff

Experiences	Recommendations
International staff often (note not always) have access to more resources and support in terms of staff wellbeing (including health care services) and security management (including evacuation, re-deployment, security protection), than their national counterparts. This additional support gives international staff opportunities to work in a	To equal the support available to international and national staff. When working with partner organisations, to spend time during capacity building focusing on LGBTI inclusion and providing examples of policies and practices that they could reasonably implement for staff. To get national organisatiosn talking about LGBTI issues and recognising

variety of contexts with the knowledge that support is in place over their wellbeing and security.	LGBTI staff in their agencies, is an important first step.
International staff often have a 'get out' in terms of their nationality/citizenship, which would facilitate an easier exist from a serious security incident or threat than national staff.	To invest in team building of national/international staff to reduce tensions over differences in local perception and perceived opportunities.
	To ensure that national staff members are included in global Equality and Diversity policies and have the chance to be LGBTI focal points for their organisation.
National staff often remain in a situation when the international staff move on. They are often part of affected communities, are known by a range of stakeholders in areas of humanitarian intervention and can face far higher or more serious reputational risk in identifying as LGBTI than 'transient' international workers. It was noted that in many contexts it is acceptable for the 'westerners' to be LGBTI as they are perceived as living a different lifestyle and to be 'policed' by a separate set of rules and customs. However, in many case it may be considered as deeply unacceptable for a local or national member of staff to live by these norms.	For organisations to emphasise the importance of anonymity when it comes to staff's status- to stamp out any 'gossip culture' or information-sharing that could pose a risk to staff. For there to be guidance and information for managers in encouraging and responding to LGBTI staff members, both national and international, who come out to them or the wider workforce.
There is a tendency for international organisations to push polices down onto the national staff of their organisations and /or national partners. A series of LGBTI inclusion that is simply pushed down to national staff without consultation and feedback is not likely to be well received and/or adhered to.	It is important that policies related to inclusion are worded and phrased in a way that can be understood in different contexts, and by national staff members.

3.5.2 Networks and Support Groups for National Staff and International Staff

Experiences	Recommendations
There are a lack of relevant and supportive networks for LGBTI staff in the humanitarian sector. An example of an existing sector wide resource includes the GAYdworker blog (https://gaydworker.wordpress.com/) which provides a forum for discussions and regular meets ups of LGBTI aid workers for mutual support and networking.	Diversity Champion Network can help give staff a clear career trajectory and show them what progress can be made.
	Staff networks give a collective voice to people in a similar situation, which can be informative for the organisation.
	There should be institutionally facilitated access to network, e.g. via online forums or in-person networking events.

SECTION 4. OUTCOMES OF THE DAY

4.1 SUMMARY OF GAPS AND MAIN CHALLENGES

- Lack of resources, especially in smaller NGOs (often national NGOs) to implement a number of the policies and practices that the private sector use, i.e.; diversity training for all staff, whistleblowing hotline dealt with by an external company, embedding an LGBTI focal point in each team, recruiting an LGBTI advisor for communications and staff advice, undertaking a diversity audit of organisational policies and attitudes, collecting and regularly maintaining LGBTI staff, devising specific policies and guidelines for LGBTI staff working on overseas deployments.

- Common throughout the sector is organisations' different treatment of national and international staff. Some examples bought up during the workshop; HR (different salaries, remuneration, housing and health allowances); attitudes (they're expendable, they are more secure because they're in their own country, they have more responsibility to protect themselves as they know the context better); information (not given the same induction, access to organisational policies and practices).

- The issue of self-identification vs. 'outing.' It is difficult for a line manager or security focal point to conduct a full risk assessment on an individual if they have not disclosed their LGBTI status. There are a number of steps that an organisation or manager can take to encourage staff to be open[4]:
  - Make sure all staff are aware of the organisation's policies relating to equality and bullying and harassment. You could display these policies in a prominent position in your work bases.
  - Challenge any homophobic comments or 'joking' firmly and immediately.
  - Use inclusive language in any communications to your services and teams.
  - Make the work environment open and inclusive.

- The profile of decision makers and security focal points, in International INGOS and the UN in particular is often an 'older', white, heterosexual male. This often acts as a barrier in adopting LGBTI inclusion as they are often not aware or in tune with access and inclusion issues facing their LGBTI staff members. This profile of security manager may also choose to 'assume' what problems an LGBTI member of staff will face, without thoroughly analysing the local context, and asking the advice of LGBTI focal points, or indeed working with the LGBTI staff member themselves to analyse potential risks and threats.

- Lack of time/stress in field based contexts mean that many issues of staff care are neglected, as well as having time to receive and digest organisational policies, training on inclusion, capacity building on LGBTI inclusion etc. Often staff's first priority is 'getting the job done'.

- Respecting local culture and law. There is an issue of NGOs wanting to adopt an 'acceptance' strategy, to be welcomed by local communities

---

[4] Stonewall. 'A Guide for Managers supporting Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Staff' http://www.northumberland.gov.uk/WAMDocuments/A90A2F3F-0C10-473A-893C-E2C83E9A155E_1_0.pdf?nccredirect=1

and beneficiaries and to act in accordance with local legislation and cultural customs. If communities' attitudes, national or local laws and the prevailing culture is not accepting of LGBTI staff, then this poses a real problem to the implementation of programmes, as well as to safety of an LGBTI staff member and their colleagues. This is linked to the challenge of reputational risk for an NGO/INGO that openly supports an LGBTI agenda countries where homosexuality is illegal/stigmatised.

4.2 SUGGESTED PRACTICES AND APPROACHES

- Mentoring and Coaching schemes connected with unconscious bias training, to challenge assumptions that staff members may hold.
- Formal recognition of staff contribution to LGBTI through allocation of budget and time, where possible, or through including in Professional Development Reports.
- Practical list of 'do-s and don't-s' for LGBTI aid workers in the field.
- Include explicit messages of the organisational approach to LGBTI and EOD in staff induction.

4.3 RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS

- Undertake a survey of global humanitarian stakeholders to collect data on; HR practices and security incidents. To further collect, consolidate and publish case studies of good practice for humanitarian organisations.
- Look for funding for LGBTI security data collection project.
- Look for funding for capacity building support for organisations looking to improve their security and inclusion practices relating to LGBTI workers.
- Conduct further awareness raising workshops and trainings (and encourage greater input from Intersexed workers & national staff).
- Develop 2 guidance papers in terms of; i) HR and staff inclusion and ii) staff safety and security. Translate in various major languages.
- Create a short booklet of advice, aimed at LGBTI aid workers working in or being deployed to various contexts. To include the advice of LGBTI workers in similar contexts. Conduct a Learning Needs Assessment amongst HR managers/staff in across a selection of global humanitarian stakeholders for LGBTI.

- Look at assessing the need/appetite for humanitarian training programmes (face to face or online) on LGBTI aid worker security and inclusion.

For organisations or donors that are interested in partnering on any of the 'recommended next steps' outlined above, or with ideas for other initiatives relating to the contents of this report, please contact us at **LGBTI@redr.org.uk**.

ANNEX I

Case Studies

Overview:

The following vignettes and accompanying questions are provided to facilitate discussion about some of the challenges that LGBTI aid workers encounter. These vignettes are not meant to be representative of the challenges per se, but do draw on an amalgamation of different 'real life' experiences. To give this activity some structure, we have aligned these experiences with four key areas: The first is connected to experiences of recruitment, the second is related to the specific challenges of international deployment, while the third and fourth relate directly to in-country experiences.

- Recruitment of LGBTI Aid Worker
- Deployment of International LGBTI Aid Worker
- In-country (International) LGBTI Aid worker
- In-country (Local) LGBTI Aid Worker

We hope that each vignette will provide the opportunity to reflect upon a diverse range of personal experiences within your group, and where possible, for group members to share examples of best-practice policies and responses from their own organisations and experiences.

Questions:

1) What are the challenges to the individual? To what extent are they specific to being LGBTI?
2) What are the challenges to the organisation? (You might wish to reflect on these challenges according to different positions within the organisation e.g. HR/Security/other colleagues.)
3) How should the organisation respond to the situation? Are there organisational policies which could/should be implemented? (Please draw on personal/organisational experiences of '[un]successful' responses or policies where appropriate.)
4) How should an organisation address discrepancies between the values of the organisation and issues surrounding staff and programmeme security or legal restrictions in-country?
5) How do/should organisations address bullying/harassment/discrimination on LGBTI issues within their own teams at different country offices?

We recognise the intersectional identities of different aid workers. While we are foregrounding sexuality, gender identity and sexual characteristics, we want to remain mindful that being LGBTI is not the sum of an individual's identity or experience of doing aid work and that gender, age, faith, race,

1. RECRUITMENT OF LGBTI AID WORKER

Jo recently graduated with distinction from an International Development Master's programmeme at an Ivy League university in the United States. Jo identifies as transgender, yet when they began to apply for jobs at INGOs, they encounter a number of challenges. One of the very first questions on most electronic application forms is: Are you a male or female? Initially, this narrow framing of gender identity was deterrent enough to keep them from applying to organisations, however it soon became clear that this was the norm across the development and humanitarian sector. Jo eventually decided to apply as female even though this was not the sex that they were assigned at birth. They were invited to interview for a position in an organisation's humanitarian personnel development programmeme, to be based initially in South Sudan. The invitation explained that candidates would be selected on the basis of a technical interview and a series of scenario-based role-plays.

Jo's interview went well and the interview panel were impressed with their educational background. Jo spoke with the panel about any concerns surrounding personal safety whilst working in South Sudan, and the interview panel felt that any associated risks could be mitigated against. Jo was offered the job, which they accepted, and they are due to complete an induction in HQ next week.

However, Jo has recently received a worrying e-mail; the organisation's security manager has raised concerns around Jo's personal security and the South Sudan's programme security, given Jo's gender identity. The South Sudan Country Director has also become aware of Jo's gender identity and has voiced concerns about Jo taking the job. The admin team has now delayed Jo's induction due to what they say is an 'increased security risk' related to Jo's presence in South Sudan.

2. DEPLOYMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LGBTI AID WORKER

Catherine is from the UK and works for a large INGO based in London. Catherine identifies as a lesbian and in 2010 she entered into a civil partnership her long-term girlfriend. They have a daughter, who is four years old. Although Catherine is currently working in the UK head office, her ambition is to gain more field experience. She was recently offered a six-month deployment in the Pakistan country office.

Catherine is not 'out' at work for fear that her bosses would decide that it was not appropriate/possible for her to be posted to countries with homophobic laws. She has heard that some organisations will support same-sex couples by sponsoring families and spouses, although there is no mention anywhere within her current workplace of any such policy. Catherine is aware that she is protected from discrimination under UK law, but the INGO she works for have a policy of working within local laws and customs in their local and regional field offices. Catherine has decided to take the deployment opportunity, despite the worry that if something happens to her during her deployment, her partner won't be immediately informed.

Catherine mentions to her line manager the possibility of someone she calls a 'friend' joining her in Pakistan during her two weeks of R&R. Her line manager suspects that the friend is Catherine's partner, but does not know how to address this with Catherine, despite having serious concerns for Catherine's personal security should her sexuality be mentioned to colleagues in-country.

3. IN-COUNTRY (INTERNATIONAL) LGBTI AID WORKER

Juan is from the Philippines and working for an INGO in a remote area of Tanzania with a small team of international staff. He had previously been very open about his sexuality in his home country, however he decided to conceal that he is gay whilst working in Tanzania where homosexuality is illegal.

Three months into the job, Juan decided to tell his colleagues about his sexuality, and they were quite supportive. However, some months later, Juan is now working out of the regional office, where he is encountering homophobic behaviour and comments from staff who were unaware that he is gay. Juan worries about his personal safety, given that colleagues in the

organisation's field office know about his sexuality and could tell colleagues in HQ, whom he fears may not be so understanding.

Juan has isolated himself and has stopped socialising. His colleagues are worried about his wellbeing, yet find it difficult to communicate with him. They are also unsure how to help.

Juan is considering leaving the organisation, and discusses this with his line manager in HQ. Two weeks later, no action has been taken by anyone in the organisation. Juan feels psychologically burnt out and completely unsupported.

4. IN-COUNTRY (LOCAL) LGBTI AID WORKER

Yolanda is the Nigerian Country Director of a medium-size INGO. She is living in Abuja with her same-sex partner. She does not speak about her relationship with colleagues in Nigeria or HQ. Recently, she has heard rumours that colleagues are talking to each other about her sexuality. She also saw her relationship being referenced negatively in an e-mail exchange between country and field office staff members. In this e-mail, the field office staff member in Katsina State in Northern Nigeria suggested that Yolanda would not be welcome in their office and should no longer visit their programmemes in the local villages.

However, as part of Yolanda's role as Country Director her presence was needed to accompany donors on a visit to the field office, and a number of projects in this area. There was growing disquiet throughout the two-week trip, which cumulated in homophobic demonstrations taking place outside the field office. Yolanda has been informed that the local government want to make an example of her and to charge her with 'carnal knowledge of any person against the law of nature' which carries a 14-year prison sentence.

ANNEX II

Useful Resources

- ILGA-Europe and ILGA-World provide comprehensive maps and reports on LGBT laws worldwide.
- TGEU provides more detailed maps and reports on the legal situation for trans people around the world, including transphobic hate crimes.
- The United Nation's 'Free & Equal Campaign' is the first UN public campaign to address LGBT rights issues.
- IGLHRC and Arc International are great places to go for information on advocating for LGBT human rights issues at the UN.
- The Institute of Development Studies has this useful tool-kit on sexual rights and social justice around the world.
- Funders for LGBTQ Issues is a good resource for international LGBT organisations seeking funding.
- Stonewall resources available at www.stonewall.org.uk, @stonewalluk and via e-mail: international@stonewall.org.uk.
- Gay aid workers' deployment dilemmas, available at Forced Migration Review.
- Gay Aid worker's perspective on deployment challenges in the Guardian.
- LGBTI aid worker safety, at Devex

The Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Map of World Laws (2015)

THE LESBIAN, GAY AND BISEXUAL MAP OF WORLD LAWS — MAY 2015
ILGA, THE INTERNATIONAL LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, TRANS AND INTERSEX ASSOCIATION — WWW.ILGA.ORG