**INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE WHOLE GROUP**

**SCENARIO 3**

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:** 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. 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!*

* Do the partners feel that their approach to security matches the nature and severity of the security risks in the context?
* 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’s experience of working with local partners however is limited.
* 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:**

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?