**INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE WHOLE GROUP**

**SCENARIO 3**

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:** high-risk country that is experiencing recurring natural disasters in an active conflict setting.

**Partner profiles:**

* **International partner:** a large international organisation that focuses on providing medical relief in humanitarian contexts, with significant experience working in conflict areas. The INGO has a country office in the operating context and field offices throughout the country. The international partner has a very robust security risk management framework in place. The INGO has flexible funding to support its local partners with capacity strengthening.
* **Local implementing actor:** a medium-sized organisation with field offices in most areas of the country. The organisation began as a volunteer medical support service in response to rising needs due to the outbreak of conflict. The national organisation has a strong positive reputation internationally and with the public, but often finds itself attacked by parties to the conflict for a variety of reasons. The national organisation has no security risk management experience or formal security risk management processes in place. Security is managed at an individual ad hoc level.

**Partnership:** the partnership has already been agreed between the partners at a senior management level. However, security risk management did not feature in these discussions. The INGO’s security advisor has insisted on discussing security risk management arrangements with the local partner to jointly assess what is in place, what gaps exist and how the INGO can support the local partner with strengthening its security risk management.

**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 of what security risk management capacity gaps there are within both partners, and how to address them?
* Is the approach to security risk management in the partnership designed to empower the L/NNGO to address security needs independently?

**INGO INSTRUCTIONS**

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

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

* The INGO has a good understanding of the security situation in the country and is part of a strong national security network that shares information and collaborates on security issues regularly.
* The INGO is being pressured by the international community to publicly demonstrate its commitment to the localisation agenda and are therefore entering into this partnership to evidence this commitment in public fora.
* The INGO has the funding, expertise and willingness to be creative about how it supports their local partner on security risk management.
* The INGO has heard that other INGOs in similar contexts have seconded international staff into the local partner to build up the local partner’s security risk management systems while being shadowed by several L/NNGO staff members.

**L/NNGO INSTRUCTIONS**

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

Consider this background when discussing with the INGO partner:

* The increasing number of incidents affecting their staff has the L/NNGO’s senior management team worried and they are keen to improve their security risk management procedures to protect their staff.
* The L/NNGO do not know that they can receive support on security risk management from their international partner and have not voiced their needs as a result. They are wary of asking for support in case this reflects negatively on the L/NNGO’s reputation.
* The L/NNGO keeps records of beneficiaries and have recently been pressured by parties to the conflict to share beneficiary data. They have resisted this demand to date, but recently experienced information security breaches which they think are being perpetrated by the parties to the conflict.
* The L/NNGO is not part of any security collaboration network.
* The L/NNGO is concerned that too much publicly visible collaboration between the L/NNGO and the INGO can result in even more negative perceptions by parties to the conflict and increased insecurity for the L/NNGO’s staff.

**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?