**INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE WHOLE GROUP**

**SCENARIO 2**

1. Distribute roles:
   1. **Identify one observer** who will observe and facilitate the conversation where necessary. The observer will feedback on the groupwork during the plenary discussion.
   2. Identify one or two individual(s) who will act as the **international NGO partner.**
   3. Identify two other individual(s) who will act as **the local NGO** **partner.**
2. Read p2 and p3 - ‘information for the whole group’
3. Read the specific sections pertaining to your role (INGO or L/NNGO). **DO NOT READ THE SECTIONS FOR THE OTHER ROLE.** Time allowing, the observer should read all sections.
4. Do the role play – you will have 15min.
5. Debrief in the group for 5min – observer & participants share their observations.

**Specific instructions have been shared for representatives of the INGO, L/NNGO and the observer below.**

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR THE WHOLE GROUP:**

**Context:** medium-risk country that is experiencing recurring natural disasters.

**Partner profiles:**

* **International partner:** a medium-sized international organisation with no office in this particular country. The focus of the organisation is on humanitarian programming with an expertise in disaster response. The international partner has a security risk management framework in place but no formal process in place to discuss security issues with partner organisations. The INGO has used up all of its funding to support its local partners with capacity strengthening in other areas, particularly programme management and finance.
* **Local implementing actor:** a medium-sized national organisation based in the country’s capital with field offices in most areas of the country. The organisation has a strong background in disaster response and a good reputation among authorities and the public. The national NGO has a dedicated security focal point and field managers who have security responsibilities.

**Partnership:**

A recent earthquake in the country means that there are immediate humanitarian needs that the national partner is responding to with funding support from the INGO.

In an area affected by the earthquake where the national NGO was responding, a national NGO staff member was kidnapped. The national NGO staff member was released following an intervention by community leaders. This NGO staff member’s salary is paid for through the partnership.

Security risk management had not been discussed by the partners in the past and this meant that the incident caused a lot of confusion between the partners on what their role should be in the event of such an incident.

**The partners are sitting together to discuss ways to improve security risk management collaboration in the future.**

**INFORMATION FOR THE WHOLE GROUP:**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

*Place yourself in the shoes of the organisation you are representing.*

Answer the following questions:

* Is there agreement between the partners on what is an acceptable risk threshold for the partnership and programmes within it?
* Is there agreement between the partners on what each organisation’s role should be in the event of a crisis or critical incident affecting either organisation in the location where the partnership is active?

**INGO INSTRUCTIONS**

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

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

* The INGO does not have first-hand information on the security context because it is not physically present in the country. The INGO therefore is not in a position to verify whether the L/NNGO’s approach to security is appropriate.
* The INGO is concerned that another incident (kidnapping) may take place and that by relying on the L/NNGO to manage security risks independently the INGO is not meeting its legal or moral duty of care.
* The INGO can only respond to the recent earthquake through their existing partnerships or by finding a new partner.
* Because of the incident, the INGO is unsure whether to continue programming in the area where the incident took place and where there seems to be a spike in incidents affecting aid workers. The INGO’s risk threshold means that it will not accept working in an area where staff members are at medium to high-risk of abduction.

**L/NNGO INSTRUCTIONS**

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

Consider this background when discussing with the INGO partner:

* The L/NNGO has only one international partner and that is the INGO. The loss of funding from the INGO partnership would result in the immediate suspension of life-saving services being provided by the L/NNGO to those affected by the recent earthquake.
* Should the INGO end the partnership, and in the absence of finding another funding source or partner quickly afterwards, the closure of the L/NNGO would be inevitable.
* There is fear that if the INGO starts unpacking the security risk management procedures in place by the L/NNGO that they will find these inadequate and withdraw funding.
* The L/NNGO is facing a lot of pressure from its field-level staff to keep them employed, as many have been personally affected by the earthquake and rely on their salaries to support themselves and their families through the recovery process.
* Because of this, the L/NNGO is willing to continue operating in the area to meet needs, despite the heightened security risks.

**OBSERVER INSTRUCTIONS:**

Facilitate the conversation to ensure partners answer the questionnaire. Take notes of what went well/wrong and share them in the chat when everyone goes back to the plenary.

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?