**INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE WHOLE GROUP**

**SCENARIO 1**

1. Distribute roles:
	1. **Identify one or two observer(s)** who will observe the conversation and then report on it during the plenary discussion. The observer(s) should also take notes on the groupwork and feed them back into the chat.
	2. Identify one or two individual(s) who will represent the international non-governmental organisation (**INGO) partner**
	3. Identify two other individual(s) who will represent the local/national non-governmental organisation **(L/NNGO) partner.**
2. Take 5min to read the background information of the scenario and then read the specific sections pertaining to your role (INGO or L/NNGO).

**Do not read the section for the other role. The observer should read all instructions.**

1. Do the role play – you will have 15min. Imagine you are representatives of your organisations and are sitting together with the other partner. Together you are going through a questionnaire to help you discuss security risk management issues. Aim to answer the questions shared below and discuss concerns that arise from each answer.
2. Debrief in the group for 5min – the observer(s) will share their thoughts on the conversation.

**Each partner organisation has a particular position and motivation with regards to the partnership. Specific instructions have been shared for representatives of the INGO, L/NNGO and the observer below.**

**INFORMATION FOR THE WHOLE GROUP:**

**BACKGROUND**

**Context:** medium-risk country, mainly development programming.

**Partner profiles:**

* **International partner:** a large international organisation with offices in most major countries, including a country office in the operating context. The focus of the organisation is on children’s rights and development programming and it has a strong positive relationship in the country with authorities and the public. The international partner has strong security risk management expertise and flexible funding to support its local partners with capacity strengthening.
* **Local implementing actor:** a medium-sized organisation based in the country’s capital working on providing sexual and reproductive health services. It has a good reputation among authorities, but negative perceptions among certain segments of the population and some religious leaders. The L/NNGO doesn’t have a dedicated security focal point and has informal procedures on how to handle risks. Security is managed by programme managers, with decision-making ultimately sitting with the head of the organisation.

**Partnership:**

The local partner, with financial support from a Western donor channelled through the international partner, is planning to open a programme providing sexual and reproductive health care services in a new location. The new location is in a rural area where the INGO already has children’s focused programmes.

**You are at the very early stages of the partnership discussion. The focus of your conversation is security risk management and your conversation will inform whether the partnership becomes formalised**.

**INFORMATION FOR THE WHOLE GROUP:**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

*Place yourself in the shoes of the organisation you are representing. More background on motivations and concerns is shared in the sections below for each partner. Be creative when you need more to keep the conversation going!*

Prepare for a joint security risk assessment by answering the following questions:

1. What threats can you see resulting from the context and what threats emerge as a result of the partnership?
2. Does the partnership change the likelihood or impact of a particular threat? If yes, is this positive or negative and which partner does it affect?
3. What can the partners each do to address some of the identified security risks?

**INGO INSTRUCTIONS**

**(TO BE READ ONLY BY INGO REPRESENTATIVES)**

Consider this background when discussing with the L/NNGO partner:

* The country director of the INGO in the operating context is worried about how the partnership will affect the perception and security of the INGO’s current programmes.
* The INGO’s HQ is under pressure from its donor to provide sexual and reproductive health services in the country. However, the INGO has no experience carrying out this type of programme in the country and is relying heavily on the expertise of the local partner.
* The INGO has had previous negative experiences around fraud with local partners in the context which has resulted in a lot of pressure from HQ to be careful about entering into new partnerships.

**L/NNGO INSTRUCTIONS**

**(TO BE READ ONLY BY L/NNGO REPRESENTATIVES)**

Consider this background when discussing with the INGO partner:

* The L/NNGO does not have its own funding to open new programmes.
* The L/NNGO is being pressured by government authorities to provide services in new programme locations, particularly rural areas. The L/NNGO hesitates to mention this pressure to the INGO because they are worried about not being perceived as ‘independent’ and risk losing the partnership contract.
* The L/NNGO is facing increasingly strong backlash on social media from religious groups which are affecting the perception of the organisation, particularly in rural areas.
* The L/NNGO’s staff is primarily composed of men from the capital city. This has resulted in challenges in gaining access to women in more conservative rural environments.

**OBSERVER INSTRUCTIONS:**

Consider the following questions and be prepared to share thoughts on these:

* What was communicated well in the group work between the two partners?
* What problems with communication arose between the two partners?
* Were all the concerns of the different partners raised in the conversation?
* What could have been done better?
* What questions should have been asked but weren’t?