

Lessons Learned from the

RISK SHARING PILOT IN HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMMING



**September
2024**

**Prepared by the Dutch Relief Alliance and the Netherlands
Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

For the Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA) and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, risk sharing is a core component of equitable partnerships within the humanitarian sector. By pursuing risk sharing, the aim is to strengthen joint responsibility and enhance the effectiveness of support delivery to affected people. In 2024, the alliance – a coalition of 14 international NGOs – and the ministry launched a pilot initiative in three country programmes: the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, and Yemen. This pilot explores risk sharing as a novel risk management strategy.

A key focus of this initiative is to ensure that the dialogue on risks involves all actors along the delivery chain, particularly providing local actors with equal opportunity to participate in this dialogue. This report, jointly prepared by the alliance and the ministry, presents the experiences and lessons learned so far, and offers recommendations for advancing risk sharing dialogues both within and beyond the alliance.



About the Dutch Relief Alliance

The Dutch Relief Alliance is an alliance of 14 Dutch NGOs¹ and local partner NGOs, working together through a partnership model for support and funding with the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to deliver coordinated and impactful joint responses in humanitarian crises.

The alliance operates in a ‘dual response mode,’ addressing both short-term acute and long-term protracted crises. In protracted crises, the alliance provides humanitarian assistance and recovery services to people affected by crisis for a period of three years. The latest block grant covers the three-year period from 2024 – 2026, operating in nine protracted crisis situations².

In 2023, the alliance worked together with 93 local partners. Local partners handled 37.1% of the joint response budget, which included funding for capacity strengthening. The alliance works towards locally led action and strives to provide quality funding through equitable partnership. The aim within the alliance is that local partners participate and are included in decision-making at an equal footing in the joint responses.

For more information about the alliance: www.dutchrelief.org

1. Currently, 14 Dutch NGOs participate in the Dutch Relief Alliance: CARE Nederland, Cordaid, Dorcas, Help a Child, Oxfam Novib, Plan International, Save the Children, SOS Children's Villages, Stichting Vluchteling, Tearfund, Terre des Hommes, War Child, World Vision Nederland, and ZOA.


2. The nine DRA protracted crises responses are in Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia, Syria government-controlled areas, Syria non-government-controlled areas, and Yemen.

Definition of Risk and Risk Sharing

In simple terms, risk is the possibility of something bad happening. From an organisational perspective, risk refers to the effect of uncertainty on an organisation's ability to meet its objectives. It involves the likelihood of unexpected events negatively affecting an organisation's work and mission.

Types of Risks

Potential categories of risks for organisations include: operational, legal/compliance, security, safety, information, fiduciary, and ethical and reputational risks, among others. These types of risks are often interconnected.



Picture:
Potential Risk Categories³

Risk sharing

Risk sharing is one of the strategies used alongside other risk management strategies to make overall risk management more effective throughout the delivery chain. Risk sharing enables all the actors in the delivery chain to collectively address all the potential risks through a holistic and collaborative approach.

Therefore, risk sharing can be understood as:

- A reasonable sharing of the burden of preventative measures, and
- A reasonable sharing of responsibility for materialising risks.

Effective risk sharing requires all actors to agree - at the front end of planning and implementation - on a holistic picture of the risks in their delivery chain, in order to collectively identify risk sharing opportunities, as well as a way to ensure that mutually-agreed risk sharing measures and responsibilities are implemented and divided.

3. Source: 'Responding Amid Uncertainty and Managing Risk in Humanitarian Setting – Resources for NGOs' by InterAction and CDA Collaborative Learning (2022). www.cdacollaborative.org

2

WHY A RISK SHARING PILOT?



UNDERSTANDING
of WHY ACTORS ACT THE WAY THEY DO.

Risk is inherent to humanitarian assistance, and working in humanitarian crises involves navigating various types of risks that may impact actors differently, shaped by their operating context, role, capacity, and position within the aid delivery chain. In other words, risk is both context specific and actor specific. **Power imbalances** in the aid delivery chain amplify inherent disparities. Consequently, local actors often bear more risks than their international counterparts but are frequently not provided with sufficient resources and support by back and intermediary donors to manage these risks.

Additionally, the risk management strategies designed unilaterally by back donors and intermediary donors can inadvertently create additional risks for local actors. The “soloistic” way in which the actors in the humanitarian system – including donors – manage risks threatens to hamper delivery; it can become an obstacle for working in the most risky and fragile circumstances, or it makes working with back donors and intermediary organisations too risky for local humanitarian actors. Thus, jointly identifying, assessing and weighing potential risks throughout the chain, agreeing on mitigating measures and division of labour and responsibilities, and on reactive measures if a risk materialises, can enhance effective and efficient delivery of assistance by and through locally led organisations who best know the context and who are and remain present.

At the start of this pilot project, the alliance’s risk management approach was for each actor to conduct their own organisational risk assessment, then all assessments were consolidated into risk matrices and proposals. This approach primarily addressed (potential) risks for the individual actors, rather than analysing risks and risk management across the entire delivery chain. But as an alliance with a strong focus on collaboration, locally led humanitarian action, and equitable partnerships, this approach is perceived as inadequate for addressing the complexities of risk management fully. It is lacking a **shared approach** along the delivery chain that could better ensure effective humanitarian assistance. This pilot project sought to assess whether a shared approach could not only distribute the burden of mitigating risks more equitably, but also address the sharing of responsibilities if those risks materialised.

‘It was a great experience and eye opening to have all relevant players in one room and speaking so openly and thoroughly about risks. From a donor perspective it was very helpful to get a better picture of the real challenges that are faced in the field’.

- a donor representative

3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

‘We felt that we have a joint responsibility for risk management in our operations, so we no longer have to feel alone when facing the risks in the field’.

- workshop participant

Since risk sharing is a new approach, the alliance and the ministry launched a pilot that would allow other programmes to later adopt the strategy and implement lessons learned. The aim of the joint pilot was to facilitate a **transparent and meaningful dialogue** with all stakeholders in the delivery chain, thus the alliance developed a practical guide on Risk Sharing Dialogue in its programmes. This practical guide was written in parallel with the [Global Risk Sharing Framework](#) developed through an iterative consultative process facilitated by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), InterAction, and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in which the alliance also participated. The pilot involved: 1) analysing the different risks and their (diverse) impacts on all actors, 2) identifying how to share risks more equally, and 3) gathering experience and collecting evidence that could then be used to influence the risk sharing policies of other donors and the entire humanitarian system.

In 2023, the protracted crisis joint response programmes in the **Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, and Yemen** were selected for the pilot, including their local, national, and international partners. The decision to participate was on a voluntary basis, which ensured that all stakeholders were motivated and enthusiastic about working in the project. A small group of representatives from the ministry, the alliance, and from local and national NGO partners was set up to lead the pilot.

The pilot secured partner buy-in during programme planning meetings by establishing necessary preconditions in the 2024 – 2026 multiyear programme, and by defining clear responsibilities for coordination. Facilitators guided the in-person workshops in each country, where participants engaged in risk sharing dialogue using the Global Risk Sharing Framework. In preparing for the workshops, the alliance focused on placing local partners’ perspectives and solutions at the centre of the risk sharing dialogue. This involved identifying and removing barriers to ensure they could equally participate in the meetings and freely share their insights.

The process culminated in joint action plans to mitigate or respond to identified risks and a commitment to ongoing dialogue for continued risk management. (See [Annex 1](#) for a detailed outline of steps to take to organise the face-to-face dialogue workshops).



4

PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCES OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

1 DESIGN of the ASSIGNMENT

2 PRE-WORKSHOP PREPARATION

3 WORKSHOP

4 REPORT

Joint response participants were asked to share their insights and experiences on the process and outcome of the workshop. This section provides a summary of these findings without disclosing the associated countries.

Before the Workshop

Preparation was crucial for the success of the workshops and meetings, with pre-workshop assignments and multiple preparatory meetings playing a vital role in building trust and ensuring everyone felt ready to engage in a face-to-face dialogue. This groundwork established a strong foundation for the workshops. In one country, three preparatory meetings were held to align partners on the risk sharing framework and workshop goals, based on the request of local partner representatives who identified the need for additional introductions for their peers. Some country programmes struggled to envision the conversations based on the framework provided and expressed a need for more examples, detailed guidance, and possibly an additional preparatory step to better identify and understand risks. While partners were asked to complete a template to assess their own organisational risks before the workshop, the specificity and detail provided by partners varied. Despite initial challenges, good preparation of the workshop participants ultimately succeeded in promoting open and meaningful communication.

During the Workshop

Overall, the pilot countries regarded the risk sharing dialogue held in the workshops as successful and useful. The workshop set-up created a safe and trusting atmosphere, enabling participants to share their perspectives freely and listen to each other without reservation. All countries emphasised the deep listening and understanding of each other's viewpoints through direct, face-to-face interaction as a key takeaway, as expressed by some of the participants:


'We sometimes had difficult conversations, we should embrace that, as by listening and understanding the point of view of the other, this is how we reach change together.'

- workshop participant

Other participants noted that this was the first time that they had had such candid discussions with other actors in the chain, or even with their own constituency within the chain. This open dialogue was perceived as crucial for advancing equitable partnerships and shared responsibility in the joint responses. The direct connection between local partners and donor representatives proved invaluable, as this was their first opportunity for such face-to-face conversations for many local and national NGOs.

After the Workshop

All workshop participants contributed to developing creative, context-specific solutions that everyone could then take ownership of, highlighting the value of involving all delivery-chain actors in the dialogue. And critical to the project's desired outcomes, the participants' increased sharing and understanding of various perspectives **improved the quality of the risk management planning by elevating the primary focus to a higher group level**, replacing the former individual organisational focus.



'It's good to interact, it's good to listen to each other – the real discussion is what happened here, because each one had the space to do so.'

- workshop participant

5

RESULTS OF THE PILOT: IDENTIFIED RISK SHARING OPPORTUNITIES

In the face-to-face dialogue workshops, participants worked together to identify and prioritise the risks that diverse actors throughout the delivery chain experience and to discuss risk sharing opportunities. These humanitarian professionals developed joint action plans that include a wide range of risk sharing solutions, categorised by risk type and including both strategic and operational measures, as well as preventative and responsive actions. Their plans also propose measures that, while not strictly related to risk management, address other aspects of programming and monitoring.

Due to confidentiality reasons, the risks identified during the workshops are shared in this report without disclosing the associated joint response country. Some of the identified risks per category and proposed actions are summarised in [Annex 2](#).

Overall, participants learned from each other's approaches, gaining new insights and learning that had not surfaced before they had this opportunity of ongoing dialogue on risk management. At the joint response level, pilot countries have started working on the follow-up for the identified risk sharing solutions. Some actions are 'quick wins' that can be quickly achieved, while others are more strategic and challenging, requiring further dialogue among actors.

This pilot project affirmed the importance of local actors having access to quality funding. Furthermore, the alliance's and ministry's common commitment to locally led capacity strengthening, where local actors can take the lead in their own organisational development, is important to mention, as they provide the necessary resources to implement the proposed actions.

At the same time, as intermediaries and back donors, both the alliance and the ministry recognised areas where they themselves need to learn and develop their capacity and understanding.

While it is too early in the process to have implemented any entirely new risk sharing strategies, promising opportunities emerged from the dialogues. These opportunities are now taken forward to see if and how these can be operationalised. For example, one supportive measure involved including the Local Advisory Group – comprising elected representatives from local and national NGO partners – in the monthly programme meetings with the ministry, which aims to foster better communication and collaboration among donors and local NGOs.

'Dare to let go of control... this is the summary of localisation – we want to give back the power to you (local partners) – the outcomes of this workshop back to you to take it forward.'

- workshop participant





THESE KEY LESSONS CAN GUIDE OTHERS LOOKING TO IMPLEMENT A RISK SHARING APPROACH.

Foundation of Trust. Pre-existing relationships and a culture of equitable partnerships within the alliance laid a good foundation for open and honest conversations on risk sharing. The existing multiyear collaboration and financing was another contributing factor to the open and frank conversations, likely reducing concerns about direct consequences on funding. While trust enhances risk sharing, it is not a prerequisite. Engaging in these dialogues can actually build trust and equity within partnerships.

Inclusive and thorough Preparation. Given that risk sharing is a relatively new concept for many actors, the success of the pilot heavily relied on inclusive and thorough preparation before the face-to-face dialogue. This preparatory phase included (online) meetings with all stakeholders (jointly or separately), pre-workshop assignments, and coordination efforts. These activities were opportunities for participants to build trust, reach a shared understanding, and manage expectations about the process. Addressing common prejudices was crucial during this phase, such as the belief that “donors will not share risks” or fears of repercussions when openly discussing organisational challenges. Inclusive and thorough preparation is essential to making the face-to-face workshops and subsequent follow-up more effective.

Participation and Commitment of all Stakeholders in the humanitarian delivery chain were pivotal to the pilot’s success. The involvement of the alliance, the ministry, and the local and national NGOs in the initiation and design of this pilot ensured that barriers faced by all participants were identified and appropriately addressed. The crucial role of local advisory group members and joint response coordinators in supporting local and national NGOs was particularly notable. Several bilateral meetings with local actors were conducted to facilitate knowledge sharing and preparation for the subsequent dialogue. Each partner should be represented at the table, especially during face-to-face dialogues, to better identify barriers to and opportunities for risk sharing. Engaging decision-makers and a mix of senior programme and finance staff is crucial, not only because they bring diverse perspectives, but also because their absence could hinder progress. In the two workshops where all stakeholders were present, the discussions were enriched, providing broader perspectives and facilitating significantly more comprehensive outcomes.

Commitment to Overcoming Logistical Challenges and Ensuring Engagement. Aligning schedules and overcoming logistical hurdles, such as travel difficulties and regional instability, were significant challenges in the process. Despite efforts to coordinate workshop locations with partners, issues like visa delays prevented full participation. Ensuring that absent stakeholders stayed engaged in subsequent steps was essential. The time-intensive nature of the process required strong commitment and dedication on the part of staff coordinating the activities – from initial sessions to final follow-up – and was essential to the success of the project.

Flexibility was a key element, both from the participants and the coordinators. This flexibility was vital, not only in making time for the pilot and workshop, but also in adapting to the varying tempos of discussions. The partners’ flexibility created

TAKE INTO ACCOUNT
POWER IMBALANCES

WHO
IS RESPONSIBLE
for WHAT?

INVOLVE
ALL the ACTORS
FROM the BEGINNING

‘This deeper level of listening is really what is needed – listen rather than talk to understand the opinion of the other. Then we can make a decision’.

- workshop participant

a dynamic and responsive, collaborative environment where partners were willing to adjust the pace, ensuring all participants could engage and contribute meaningfully. This adaptability fostered openness and depth in sharing. In particular, the facilitation of small group/mixed group work and plenary follow-ups ensured active involvement from all participants, even when language posed a challenge.

Shared Understanding and Expectations Management. Risk sharing is a complex topic often misunderstood due to its seemingly simple name. Clearly defining risk sharing principles before the workshop, and revisiting these definitions throughout to avoid misconceptions and align expectations was critical. Specifying what is not risk sharing can also help prevent false assumptions. Failure to clarify these points can lead to unrealistic expectations that may overshadow results and undermine long-term trust. Partners needed to recognise that achieving a common understanding requires time for confusion, clarification, and discussion. Investing this time is crucial for reaching actionable conclusions and ultimately leads to better humanitarian outcomes.

Inclusive Dialogue. Keeping risk sharing principles, such as confidentiality and non-punitive discussions, central to the conversation helps address power imbalances and achieve meaningful dialogue. Allowing enough time and facilitating both separate and joint discussions takes into account power dynamics and organisational cultures, thereby creating a supportive environment. In this pilot, the separate preparation meetings with local partners worked well, as they often feel barriers to speaking freely, whether due to their perception of cultural appropriateness, or out of fear of losing their access to funding. A key lesson was that all actors needed encouragement to openly share their risks and challenges, as this openness is not yet common practice. The encouragement provided to all partners facilitated their genuine engagement in the pilot. Local partners highlighted the importance of discussing risk management and sharing with other actors in the humanitarian delivery chain. The presence of donor staff did not seem to negatively influence the level of openness, in fact, local staff said they especially appreciated the direct engagement with donors.

Language Barriers. Language barriers had to be considered in the workshop design and preparation. For example, planning for the additional time required to translate the Global Risk Sharing Framework and relevant guidance into local languages is important. During the workshop, if the facilitator did not speak the national language of most participants, extra attention and time was required to ensure full participation and open dialogue among all participants.

Inclusive and Engaging Workshop Facilitation. Strong facilitation skills were needed to engage stakeholders in sensitive dialogues, create a safe environment, and enhance understanding of risk management and sharing in humanitarian programming. Having at least one facilitator (international or local) was crucial, as it allowed the programme coordination team to participate fully, assist with translation and logistics, and contribute to discussions and outcomes. Allowing sufficient time for introductions and employing creative and inclusive workshop formats, e.g. energisers, helped ensure equal and effective participation. Facilitators were involved in the preparations to align expectations and reach a shared understanding on the vision and objectives of the dialogue. Otherwise, misalignment of the facilitators’ goals with the workshop’s objectives could have disrupted the discussion.

Inter-constituency dialogue. It was observed that that it could be counterproductive to split the workshop group into small sessions of local vs

WHO NEEDS
To BE at the
TABLE

international actors after the risk inventory and prioritisation stage. Hearing and understanding the risks and perceptions of other constituencies was crucial for all constituencies, as this enhanced the formation of trust that was the basis for successful risk sharing outcomes. For instance, one of the workshops focused often on intra-constituency discussions and therefore failed to fully seize the opportunity for inter-constituency dialogue (especially including donors), which is vital for arriving at solutions that can only be found with all constituencies working together.


Strict Workshop Content, Structure, and Focus. Risk sharing is a technical and complicated topic that intersects with many other topics. The limited time available in a workshop, coupled with the large number of risks to work through, called for following a strict and efficient workshop structure with good timekeeping. Furthermore, keeping the focus on risk categories rather than getting sidetracked by broader contextual challenges is equally important.

Workshop Outcomes. The pilot project taught the importance of working through all steps of the risk sharing dialogue framework to seize the opportunity to develop a joint action plan of next steps and disseminate the findings to the wider humanitarian community. The final selection of solutions and actions should be collectively agreed by the delivery-chain actors to secure sustainable solutions to humanitarian challenges. The workshop facilitator should ensure that the actions discussed have the majority's approval. This approach fosters a sense of collective decision-making and inclusivity, which is crucial for the acceptance of the plan going forward. Once finalised, the action plans again go to participants for final approval before being shared more widely. Please note that the most sensitive issues discussed in the workshops were not captured within these reports, due to the sensitivity of the content.

How To DECIDE on WHAT TYPE of RISK To FOCUS?

'We should not be in a hurry, we should continue the conversation'

- workshop participant



7

OVERALL REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS



The three pilot programmes quickly prioritised this opportunity to pilot risk sharing early in the process, recognising it as a significant step forward in addressing systemic barriers to equitable partnerships – barriers that could not have been effectively tackled by other initiatives or independently. **This top priority and main motivation for the pilot project was met, fulfilling all expectations.**

This pilot not only led to the identification of concrete risk sharing solutions and planned actions, but also **fostered tangible improvements in partner collaboration.** For instance, local partners began communicating more openly with international counterparts, holding them accountable, and raising questions and concerns more freely. Furthermore, the pilot study demonstrated that risk sharing dialogues support shared responsibility and collaborative impact, potentially enhancing the quality and effectiveness of principled humanitarian action through improved risk management.

Through this study and paper, the Dutch Relief Alliance and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs aimed to contribute to the understanding of the benefits of risk sharing among different actors in protracted crises. While too early to report on the high-level impact of the process, the experiences and perspectives of all the stakeholders highlight the significant value of this approach, which will be an ongoing effort of the alliance and the ministry. The insights gleaned from these kickoff workshops **will increase mutual learning to benefit ongoing pilot projects in this field, and will also contribute to the ministry's diplomatic efforts to enhance risk sharing in humanitarian action across the globe.**

THE WORKSHOP EMPOWERED LOCAL PARTNERS TO SHARE OPENLY

POWER AWARENESS



Annex 1 The Step-by-Step Process of Preparing and Conducting the Risk Sharing Dialogue Workshops

THE MAIN STEPS TO ORGANISE THE PILOT INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING:

- **Ensure partner buy-in** by introducing risk sharing in programme planning meetings with all local and international partners.
- **Establish preconditions for the pilot** by including it in the 2024 – 2026 multiyear programme proposal, and by allocating the required budget and staff.
- **Define clear responsibilities** with joint response coordination staff organising the pilot in their respective country programmes. The Local Advisory Group representatives ensured local actors' perspectives and needs were included, while the Risk Sharing Working Group, including representatives from the ministry and the alliance, advised on the process and captured learnings.
- **Recruit facilitators** who combine risk and localisation expertise. Facilitation is key to maintaining structure in an interactive process and ensuring tangible outcomes.
- **Invite the right participants** by ensuring each stakeholder is represented with programme and finance staff of appropriate seniority, enabling fully informed discussions and, where appropriate, decision-making.
- **Organise preparations** by holding a pre-workshop (which could be online) to introduce and prepare all participants. Bilateral meetings can also be arranged as needed to provide support, ensuring all actors understand the process and are confident in their ability to participate equally.
- **Assign pre-workshop tasks** where participants are asked to prepare and bring their organisational risks and current risk management approaches to the workshop. This enables partners to adequately prepare the (senior) staff member attending the workshop, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of all relevant aspects of risk management. This knowledge then serves as a foundation for workshop discussions.
- **Conduct a face-to-face workshop** (two to three days, due to the sensitivity of the topics.) The actual risk sharing dialogue took place physically, with no online participation. Holding the workshops without online participation created a safe environment for discussing sensitive topics openly under Chatham House rules.
- **Follow the process of the Risk Sharing Dialogue** as outlined in the [Global Risk Sharing Framework](#). This process was used in two of the three kickoff meetings, while one meeting followed a structure designed by the consultant involved. The workshop design should include the following components:
 - **Holistic risk identification:** To structure key risks in a coherent and consistent manner, the meetings used InterAction's risk categories, namely Safety, Security, Operational, Ethical, Reputational, Legal/Compliance, Fiduciary, and Information/Data risk. Risk identification is a crucial step in understanding each other's risk perspectives. The process is complex and necessarily involves periods of confusion about the exact meaning of terms used and objectives of the discussions undertaken.
 - **Risk prioritisation:** Consider different perspectives, priorities, and power imbalances in deciding on priority risks. In early steps of the process, separating local/national actors and international actors into different groups can help each group to efficiently develop their big picture recommendations. However, the crucial next step is to bring the two groups together to share experiences and insights unique to each group active in the delivery chain. This **joint analysis and discussion** about preventative and responsive measures is essential. Focus on more than one risk category and identify a range of risks prioritised by the different actors to best use people's time and resources. The Global Risk Sharing Framework proposes a joint analysis and prioritisation of risks to further unpack different types of risks. However, focusing too much on categorisation of risks can be time consuming. For example, one workshop combined safety and security risks into a single category to avoid confusion and excessive focus on discriminating between the two. The group expects to re-visit the different risk categories discussed and update action points accordingly.
 - **Risk response strategy assessment:** What risk response strategies – including the decision not to act (made either actively or passively) – do different actors in the delivery chain currently use to address the critical elements of the key risks

that were identified in the previous stage? Choose which risk sharing options are appropriate and feasible.

- **Action planning:** Identify practical measures and actions in preventative and responsive risk sharing and how to plan for those.

- **Document the workshop.** Participants in one of the workshops captured their discussion in a shared online document, which was very useful in gathering all feedback in such a short timeframe and to build on it in the following sessions. This approach also captured small group discussions held in the local language. The facilitators then used the breaks to capture and make available all the content for the next session. This approach ensured that all valuable insights and contributions were documented effectively.

- **Document the discussions and create a Joint Action Plan.** The Risk Sharing Joint Action Plans should include timelines for each action, identification of who in each organisation is responsible for driving change, and an outline of the feedback arrangements supporting follow-up and progress monitoring.

- **Agree on next steps.** Two main aspects in the follow-up are: 1) implementation of the joint action plan by all stakeholders and making arrangements for progress updates, and 2) a follow-up workshop to address remaining risk categories in the framework and continue the dialogue. Recognise that the workshop is just the beginning of an ongoing conversation, and commit to maintaining these important discussions for lasting impact.



Annex 2 Examples of Risks Identified and Proposed Joint Action Plans

Type of risk	Description of identified risk	Proposed action
Operational risks	Challenges in managing and coordinating supply chains effectively.	Set up a joint supplier database accessible to all and create a working group within the joint response to ensure information exchange and joint efforts on supply chain challenges.
Security risks	Negative media campaigns against humanitarian activities by certain groups in society, potentially impacting staff security.	Develop communication materials (articles, press releases, social media content) tailored to the local context and language for each platform used.
Safety risks	Risks related to the physical safety of humanitarian staff, including workload, stress, and unsafe conditions that affect the well-being of staff.	Budget for staff safety and security, advocate for health insurance for local partner staff, develop SOPs on safety and security, and organise safety training for local partner staff.
Information risks	Risk of data breaches of beneficiaries' personal information.	Establish and advocate for SOPs on beneficiary data protection, seek donor flexibility, and engage with the Protection Cluster to get their support to draft data protection policy.
Partnership risks	Fear or inability of local NGOs to report concerns, even anonymously.	Conduct anonymous partnership surveys across the country, develop feedback mechanisms, and ensure NGOs are aware of their rights.
Human resources and capacity risks	Lack of HR capacity and high staff turnover among local NGOs.	Advocate for sufficient salary scales, indirect funding, and mandatory ICR. Respect local standards rather than imposing INGO standards on local partner NGOs.

Questions? Please contact:

Alycke de Haan Slomp - a.slomp@zoa.ngo

Marieke Pijnenburg - marieke.pijnenburg@minbuza.nl

About this publication

Visuals: www.pataleta.net

Photos: Dutch Relief Alliance, unless indicated otherwise

This report, jointly prepared by Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA) and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.