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Background
Macro-Monitoring of UN Security Council Resolution 1612 Violations

- Collaboration between UNICEF, Columbia University, and the CDC
- Application of public health methods
- Pilot studies in CAR, Sri Lanka, and DRC
- Need to understand context of sites and transitional countries
Formative qualitative assessment in Nepal

- Transition into post-conflict setting
- Conservative cultural practices
- Changing nature of violations in different regions
- Emerging non-state armed groups in certain regions
- Strong civil society
Focus on four violations:

- Abduction of children
- Recruitment and use of children
- Attacks on education
- Sexual violence
Four overarching study objectives:

- To collect information on current monitoring and reporting activities and systems
- To build connections with child protection actors in Nepal
- To document community perceptions of the four violations
- To determine feasibility of carrying out additional data collection in the future
Methods
Qualitative techniques included **key informant interviews and focus group discussions**
Key informants were from NGOs, IOs, government, UN agencies (n=31)
Focus group discussions were conducted in municipalities and villages in three different districts of Nepal.

18 FGDs, 145 participants

- 9 female groups - 70 participants
  - 5 youth groups
  - 2 single women’s groups
  - 2 adult women/guardians groups

- 9 male groups - 75 participants
  - 4 youth groups
  - 2 mixed – NGOs, teachers, CBOs, guardians groups
  - 1 farmers group
  - 2 adult men groups
Siraha and Dhankuta - FGD Sites

Kathmandu – FGD Guide Pilot Site

Kailali - FGD Site

Legend
- Boundary
- International boundary
- Regional boundary
- District boundary
- Ecological Zone
  - Mountain
  - Hills
  - Terai
Activities and exercises were used along with more traditional question/discussion format during the FGDs.
Respondents’ Definitions and Examples of Sexual Violence

- rape
- sexual harassment
- physical exploitation
- boys teasing girls
- inappropriate/unwanted touches and looks
- using abusive words
- causing mental and physical stress
- marital rape
- incest
- having sex forcefully
- sexual relations without consent

- sexual intercourse against her will
- [sex] against her desire
- physical and verbal aggression and harassment of a sexual nature
- use of technology such as mobile phones to send pornography
- exchange of sex for work, home security, or pay
- restriction of women’s power to make decisions about their reproductive health
Results
Participants shared many concerns about sexual violence in their communities.
Perceived prevalence during conflict varied; some thought rape was used frequently by armed groups and others felt it was a safer time.
Participants conveyed their perception that SV is pervasive in post-conflict Nepal.
Respondents suggested variance in prevalence of sexual violence depended on geography and sociocultural practices.
Women and children experience the most sexual violence because of gender discrimination.
Because of lack of property rights, women are more at risk of sexual violence. If they don’t have full rights over their property, they are dependent on men and more vulnerable and have to do what men say.

-Key informant, Kathmandu
Perpetrators of SV are different post-conflict from during the conflict.
Women face lots of problems. Police and army personnel, who are considered to be responsible in giving security, tease the girls by calling them malya or soltini (words used to tease). So who will be responsible in this matter?

- Girls’ FGD, Siraha
Family members, neighbors, law enforcement, and strangers perpetrate sexual violence in public and private spaces.
Women get raped while walking on the road.
- Women’s FGD, Siraha

I have heard many cases of girls being raped and harassed by teachers in schools, but also harassment in public on the streets, in transportation, and in their homes.
- Key informant, Kathmandu
Conclusions
Study results show

- Numerous opportunities and strategies to address SV in Nepal
- Importance of considering terminology when describing SV
- Gaps in monitoring and low reporting mean incomplete understanding of SV
- Community and stakeholder perceptions of SV differ from monitoring and reporting
- Obstacles to reporting may need to be addressed prior to conducting quantitative study
Recommendations for addressing SV in Nepal:

- Community-oriented approaches to prevention programming
- Household survey
- Reproductive health camps
- School-based monitoring
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