This guidance note is aimed at group facilitators. The guideline explains the methodological foundations around which the group work sessions have been designed as well as suggest the different steps facilitators might want to follow under the workshop.

Method
The method chosen for the group work is the organisational comparative advantage methodology. This methodology helps participants in performing a systematic analysis of internal and external factors that affect an organization’s ability to take on new task, projects or objectives, as well as identifying the resources that would be required should the organisation decide to go ahead. While the methodology uses scoring scales for the different set of factors that influence comparative advantage, the true value of this method resides in the deliberation processes that take place among participants throughout the discussions. The objective of this method is to help organisations making decisions that are more informed based on their current comparative advantage and the feasibility of mobilising the resources that would be required when taking on a new task.

IPA DRAM has identified five main areas in which the programme results can be sustained and at the same time contribute to the strengthening of DPPI SEE, which all aim at increasing the understanding of risk in the region. In order to help DPPI SEE and IPA DRAM analysis the feasibility of this proposal, workshop participants will analyse each of the results according to some key dimensions. For the purpose of this workshop, three dimensions have been chosen for the analysis. Two internal dimensions, organizational relevance and capacity, and one external dimension, enabling environment. These are defined as follows:

1. **Organisational relevance**: organisational relevance refers to the organisational mandate, past and current work, as well as any planned future work. The purpose is to analyse the suitability of the proposed result in the light of those dimensions.

   **Guiding questions:**
   
   Does the organisation’s mandate back the adoption of this objective/result?  
   Is the organisation pursuing similar or comparable objectives as part of its operations?  
   Is the result coherent with the organisation’s current or planned line of work?
How would the organisation profit from pursuing the objective?

Are there any legal constraints to the adoption of the objective?

Does this organisational mandate require amendments in order to pursue this objective? Are these amendments feasible?

2. **Organisational capacity**: organisational capacity refers to the resource capacity of the organisation. The aim is to assess if the organisation possesses the technical and financial resources necessary to pursue the objective. It is important to differentiate between the type of resources, technical or financial, since deficits in the different resources can affect differently the relevance and feasibility of adopting new objectives. Technical resources refer to the organisation’s human capital and knowledge, as well as infrastructural resources (including ICT). Financial resources refer to the organisational funding and its ability to mobilise funding.

   **Guiding questions:**

   Does the organisation currently have the knowledge to pursue this objective? If not, would it be feasible for the organisation to mobilise this knowledge?

   Does this organisation currently have the required human resources to pursue this objective? Would it be possible for the organisation to mobilise additional human resources if required?

   Does this organisation possess the necessary physical or technical infrastructure to pursue this objective?

   Does the organisation have space within its financial structure to pursue this objective?

   Can the organisation mobilise additional financial resources if necessary?

3. **Enabling environment**: the enabling environment refers to the conditions surrounding the organisation that might support or deter the pursuance of the objective. A critical factor of the enabling environment is the organisational external recognition, that is, how the organisation perceived by other actors within its operating environment.

   **Guiding questions:**

   How do other actors perceive the organisation? Would these actors acknowledge the organisational legitimacy to pursue the objective?

   Would other actors be supportive with the organisation in pursuing this objective?

   Would other actors oppose the pursuance of the objective? Why?

   Are there any other factors within the organisation’s operational environment that would support the pursuance of this objective?
Are there other factors within the organisation’s operational environment that would counteract the pursuance of this objective?

Each of these dimensions will be rated in accordance with the conclusions of the discussions among participants. It is important that there is consensus among participants about the rating assigned to each of the dimensions. The scale used for the ratings is a 5 points scale and ratings respond to the following categorisation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The organisation lacks any of the required conditions within this dimension to pursue the objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The organisation lacks the majority of the required conditions within this dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The organisation lacks some of the required conditions within this dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The organisation meets the required conditions within this dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The organisation exceeds the required conditions within this dimension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is preferable to land the scoring within the given categories, it is possible to agree on scores that fall within to categories (e.g. 3,5; 4,5). When this situation arises, it is important to document what motivates an intermediate score.

**Process**

Two different sessions have been planned for these exercises. Each session has been allocated 1.5 hours, although there will be some flexibility within the schedule to accommodate additional time needs. Groups have been designed in advance and each group will count with representatives from DPPI SEE, representatives from IPA DRAM, and eventually other participants. Your role as facilitators are to support group in achieving the objective of the group work, moderate the discussions, ensure that the group remains focused on the task, ensure active and inclusive participation from all the group members, to the extent that it is possible broker consensus among participants.

**Group session 1:**

The first session deals with the comparative advantage analysis with a focus on assessing the three comparative advantage dimensions. The methodology will be presented by the workshop facilitator during the plenary session. You will receive a printout with a diagram to note the scores for the different dimensions (see below).
This is an analysis of DPPI SEE organisation, make sure the knowledge about DPPI SEE is provided by its members. IPA DRAM members are there to provide additional information about the IPA DRAM results, answer questions, provide a realistic picture of the resources required or any details relevant to enable the analysis.

**Steps:**

1. Jointly decide and appoint a group rapporteur and a note taker. These will also play this role in the afternoon session, make sure they are aware of it.
2. Go through the methodology and ensure all participants understand the exercise.
3. Assess only one dimension at a time.
4. Devote enough time for the discussion to take place and for all participants to engage in the discussion.
5. Document the arguments that motivate the rating given to each dimension. (Document digitally if possible, otherwise just in legible handwriting. Documentation will be submitted for the records of the workshop).
6. Reflect the group’s scoring for each dimension in the A3 printout provided.
7. Should the ratings be low (between 1-2) for each of the dimensions, explore with the participants if there would be other alternatives to DPPI SEE and the negative effects of not pursuing this objective for the development of risk management systems in the region.
8. Ensure your rapporteur feels ready to present this in the plenary.

**Group session 2:**

The second session deals with the resources or actions required to pursue the objective. The methodology will be presented by the workshop facilitator during the plenary session of the morning. The departure point of this exercise is the analysis done during the first group exercise. Your scoring for each dimension is as well as description of the constraints of the organisation to pursue the objective. The aim of this session is to identify which existing resources can be used and which additional resources would be required, as well as identifying any additional actions that might be required, e.g. advocacy towards the members, advocacy towards other actors, etc.

**Steps:**

1. Go through the methodology and ensure all participants understand the exercise.
2. Assess only one dimension at a time.
3. Devote enough time for the discussion to take place and for all participants to engage in the discussion.
4. Document the existing resources (organisational resources dimension) or supporting factors (organisational relevance and enabling environment) focusing on those that are most relevant.
5. Document the necessary resources (organisational resources dimension) as well as how these resources could be mobilised. Differentiate between knowledge, human or financial or technical infrastructure resources.
6. Document which additional actions would be required to positively influence the scoring for the other two dimensions (organisational relevance and enabling environment): advocacy, information dissemination, etc. Who could be in charge and lead these actions?

7. Ensure your rapporteur feels ready to present this in the plenary.

Rapporteurs will present in the plenary the output of your discussions. There will be an opportunity for other workshop participants to pose questions and comments, make sure your group is ready and willing to assist your rapporteur in answering those.

Throughout the exercises, the workshop facilitator will be at available to the different group facilitators and groups to provide additional information and support you in your task.