



Gender and intersectionality workbook for security sector actors promoting equal access to security

Annex

Annex: Facilitator guide: sensitive issues, power and interactive exercises

➤ **A one-day (≈ 7 hours) participatory workshop for 12–25 participants from security institutions. Mixed-rank group work.**

1. Your role and stance

- Frame the day as operational, not ideological: “This is about better decisions, safer operations, and fairer institutions, using an intersectional lens as a tool.”
- Emphasise that the workbook has no “right answers” and that the aim is honest reflection on how policies and operational decisions and design land on different people, inside and outside the institution.
- Model curiosity and humility: name that you also have blind spots from your own positionality, and that everyone (including senior officers) is learning.
- Prompt you can use: “We are here to understand how rules, routines and images in our heads shape who is protected, who is overlooked, and who carries hidden burdens in our institutions.”

2. Handling sensitive and high risk moments

The workbook touches positionality, discrimination, night shifts, use of force, and complaints – all highly sensitive in security institutions. Anticipate these flashpoints and be prepared.

Common sensitive points

- Positionality check (“Who am I and how does that affect what I see?”) can feel like a threat to officers’ self image as neutral and fair.
- Exercises on identity (gender, ethnicity, disability, rank, sexuality, religion, migration status) may surface stereotypes or jokes.
- Case studies on night shifts and use of force may mirror real scandals, internal grievances or ongoing complaints.
- NAPRI+ “WHY” questions can be perceived as criticism of the institution or leadership.

Facilitation tips

- Normalize discomfort: “If you feel defensive, confused or frustrated, that is not a sign of failure – it means we are touching real power and habits.”
- Separate person from pattern: when someone feels accused, shift language from “you officers...” to “In our procedures / the current roster rule / this SOP, who is treated as the default? Who as the exception?”. Sharing examples from other countries, cultures, institutions that DCAF has worked with.
- Translate to operational language: constantly link intersectionality to mission success,

risk management, community trust and career fairness.

- Offer “pressure release” options:
 - Opt in / opt out for reading or sharing personal reflections in plenary, especially from the positionality check and identity bubbles.
 - Allow participants to pass in rounds without explanation (“I pass for now”).
- If someone makes a harmful comment (sexist, racist, mocking disability, etc.), respond to the impact, not the label:
 - “Let’s pause. If we accepted that statement as normal, would there be people in this room or in our units who would feel less safe to speak? What assumption is underneath?”

3. Levelling power in mixed rank groups

You will likely have senior officers, junior ranks, specialist roles (gender desk, HR, community liaison) and sometimes civilians or CSOs in the room. The structure must do the levelling.

Group composition

- Use mixed rank tables, but protect junior voices:
 - 4–6 people per group, ensure there are mixed tables with senior/junior staff.
 - If one senior commander dominates, move them to a “leaders’ space” for a later part where hierarchy is an asset (e.g., turning findings into commitments).
- Mix functions: patrol, HQ, HR, gender desks, investigations, etc., so that operational and policy perspectives meet.

Participation rules

Introduce explicit “ground rules” early and post them visibly:

- “One voice at a time; everyone speaks once before anyone speaks twice.”
- “Speak from your role and experience, not on behalf of all women / all minorities / all commanders.”
- “Challenge ideas and structures, not people.”
- “What is said in the room stays in the room; what is learned can be taken out.”

Practical tools

- Round robins: after a task, go around the table; each person shares one sentence reflection or one question, including the quietest ranks.
- Post its / anonymous boards: ask participants to write examples of unfair rosters or use of force concerns anonymously, then cluster them on a wall; this lowers the risk for junior staff.
- Coloured cards: give each participant a green card (to signal “I want to speak”) and a red card (to signal “This is too fast / I feel unsafe with the direction”); agree that a raised red card pauses discussion.

4. Designing interactive use of the workbook

The workbook already offers strong case studies (night shifts, use of force) and the NAPRI+ tables. You can run them in groups or pairs to keep the energy high and the learning social.

Positionality check

INDIVIDUAL → PAIRS → PLENARY

➤ **Purpose:** help participants see that different officers see different risks and needs in the same street, because of who they are and where they stand in the institution.

From an officer's perspective, a "positionality check" can feel abstract, personal, and even risky as it challenges their ideal of "neutrality". So, it helps to name those tensions and structure the conversation carefully. This section can easily trigger defensiveness. Officers carry a self image as fair, disciplined professionals. Therefore, the facilitator must anchor this exercise in operational realities, supporting better decisions, and safety.

Steps:

1. Silent individual work (5-7 minutes)

- A. Ask people to fill in the three questions on identities, what they see / overlook, and whose voices they rely on.
- B. Stress that they will choose what to share; they are not required to disclose sensitive elements.

2. Pairs (10 minutes)

- A. Same rank or similar rank pairs to reduce fear of judgement.
- B. Guiding questions:
 - "What surprised you about what you wrote?"
 - "Is there a situation where your positionality helped you see a risk earlier than others?"

3. Plenary debrief (10-15 minutes)

- A. Invite volunteers. Use debrief prompts from the annex:
 - "What did you write that surprised you?"
 - "Whose voice is missing from your analysis of your own work?"
- B. Quickly link to operations: "If these blind spots exist among us, what does that mean for how we design a night shift roster, a checkpoint, or a use of force SOP?".

Night shift roster case

SMALL GROUPS

- Purpose: reveal how “equal treatment” (same number of nights) can produce unequal and unsafe outcomes when intersecting identities are ignored.

Steps (30–40 minutes):

1. Group set up

- A. 4–6 participants per group, mixed rank and function.
- B. Give each group: scenario, list of officers A–J, the bubble identity wheel, and blank monthly calendars.

2. Phase 1. Identity bubbles (10 minutes)

- A. Ask participants to explain how the characters’ identity factors affect their likelihood of using force and being victim of force.
- B. Prompt: “Who is always seen as available? Whose constraints are treated as personal problems, not institutional issues?”.

3. Phase 2. “Apparently fair” roster (10–15 minutes)

- A. Instruct groups to apply the HQ rule strictly: all staff do an equal number of nights.
- B. Then ask them to identify three concrete harms (health, safety, family, career) that result from this “equal” roster for at least two officers (e.g., Lina, Omar, Jonas, Kofi).
- C. Debrief quickly in plenary: take 2–3 examples and write them on flipchart under “Hidden harms of ‘equal’ rosters”.

4. Phase 3. Intersectional redesign (10–15 minutes)

- A. Now ask groups to redesign the roster to:
 - Keep operational requirements (coverage, driver, first aid, senior on weekends).
 - Reduce compounded harm for those with overlapping vulnerabilities.
 - Reserve some career enhancing nights for those usually overlooked (e.g., junior women, officers with disabilities).
- B. Require groups to define explicit criteria (e.g., max consecutive nights; guaranteed rest days for caregivers; safe transport for those living far; rotation of high profile weekends).
- C. In plenary, ask: “Which criteria would you be willing to defend to your commander or union as fair and operationally sound?”

This exercise is ideal for surfacing power dynamics gently: who gets protected informally, who is expected to “sacrifice”, and how that tracks across gender, rank, family status, disability, and minority status.

Use of force policy case

FISHBOWL

> Purpose: show how a “neutral” policy produces unequal outcomes when intersecting identities (race, class, disability, migration, gender identity, age) are ignored.

Suggested format (30–40 minutes):

1. Individual reflection (5 minutes)

- A. Ask participants to write down three hidden assumptions in the “neutral” use of force policy about who is dangerous, who is cooperative, whose complaint is believed.

2. Fishbowl discussion (20 minutes)

- A. Inner circle: 5–6 volunteers discuss the street market incident (Amina, Musa, David, Sara; Tomas, Laila, Elena) using guiding questions printed from the workbook.
- B. Outer circle: observers note when stereotypes, language barriers, disability, age or gender identity change officers’ perception of threat or compliance.
- C. Swap some people between inner and outer circles halfway through.

Close by asking each table for one small, realistic policy adjustment (wording, reporting, resourcing) they would propose to the Ministry.

Using NAPRI+

➤ **Introduce the NAPRI+ tool as a bridge from exercise to participants' own real decisions.**

- Framing NAPRI+ for security actors
- How to introduce it in plenary:
- “NAPRI+ is not a checklist; it is a way to slow down and ask smarter questions before we sign off a roster, a policy, a deployment plan, or a negotiation team.”
- Connect to their mandate:
 - Needs → “Are we protecting all the people in need of protection?”
 - Access → “Can people reach us in practice?”
 - Participation → “Who actually shapes the decision?”
 - Resources → “Who gets what they need to do the job safely?”
 - Impact → “Who is safer or more exposed 12 months from now, and how would we know?”
- Make explicit that every letter must be read through an intersectional lens: gender plus at least two other axes (rank, class, ethnicity, age, disability, migration status, sexuality, etc.)
- Explain the WHAT and WHY layers to both questions and ensure they understand that the specific wording can be modified and adapted to each situation.
- Go through the example scenario asking them to respond to each question.

Reflection question to the room:

- “In your current job, where do you already collect information for NAPRI+, and where do you decide based on ‘how it has always been done’?”

Working each letter with concrete prompts

N – Needs

Goal: Move from “generic user” to three distinct profiles whose needs differ.

“Sample” facilitation script:

Ask groups to pick a concrete decision (e.g. night shift roster, new checkpoint, revision of a use of force SOP, or any other example from their work).

Ask them to sketch three profiles of people affected – not the “average user”:

- Inside the institution (e.g. junior woman in public order team with caregiving duties; senior male officer close to HQ; officer with disability in rural post).
- And/or in the community (e.g. undocumented migrant woman, teenage boy from stigmatised neighbourhood, older person with mobility issues).

Guiding questions you can write on a flipchart:

- “What does each profile need to be safe, heard and able to use or deliver this service?”
- “Which needs are seen as ‘normal’ in current practice and which are treated as ‘special cases’?”
- “What happens when someone’s need is invisible – what risk does that create for them and for the institution?”

Encourage participants to name at least one need that is currently invisible in their institution (e.g. safe transport for officers finishing late, private space for trans civilians to be searched, sign language or simple language communication).

A – Access

Goal: Reveal “drop off points” where certain profiles lose access or give up.

Steps for group work:

For each profile, ask them to trace the path to the decision or service:

- “Where do they start? What steps do they take? At what time? In which language? Who must they talk to?”.

Ask them to mark where each profile drops off:

- Because of paperwork, distance, curfew, childcare, fear of harassment, past bad experience, stigma, uniformed presence, etc..

Facilitator probes:

- “What barrier sits at each drop off point: geography, language, cost, rank, digital literacy, dress codes, rigid schedules?”
- “Who benefits – or feels more comfortable – when that barrier stays in place?”

Invite them to think internally too:

- “How easy is it for a junior officer, a woman of colour in leadership, or a gender desk officer to access key decision forums in your institution? Where do they ‘drop off’?”

P – Participation

Goal: Make visible who proposes, who decides, and who is only informed or consulted.

You can use a Group mapping exercise (if needed):

On a sheet, draw four columns: Propose – Decide – Implement – Consulted.

For the chosen decision (roster, policy, deployment, negotiation team), ask groups to list:

- Which ranks and functions usually sit in each column.
- Who is regularly missing (e.g. patrol officers, female officers, minority officers, disability focal points, community liaison, CSOs).

Facilitation prompts:

- “Who is in the room when the key decision is taken? Who is only informed afterwards?”
- “Who is present but not heard – people who attend the meeting but rarely speak or are overruled?”
- “What in our professional culture, meeting practices, or promotion paths keeps them silent? Time of meetings? Language? Jokes? Seating arrangements?”
- “Why does ‘consulted’ rarely become ‘deciding’ for certain groups?”

Ask each group to name one procedural tweak that would move at least one actor from “consulted” to “co deciding” (e.g. joint drafting committee, rotating chair, mandatory presence of a gender or community representative in certain decisions).

R – Resources

Goal: See how people, money, time, equipment and attention are distributed – and what inequalities that creates.

Group task:

Ask participants to list the key resources needed to implement their decision:

- Trained officers, vehicles, radios, body cams, interpreters, safety equipment, childcare arrangements, overtime budget, supervision time, de escalation training, etc..

Then ask:

- “Where are these resources concentrated (HQ vs branches; majority vs minority neighbourhoods; elite tactical units vs regular patrols; capital vs rural areas)?”.

Probing questions:

- “Who consistently has to ‘make do’ with less?”
- “If we deliberately shifted one resource – more de escalation training, interpreters, safer vehicles, flexible scheduling – toward those facing the ‘triple burden’, what inequality would it reduce?”
- “Who would object to this reallocation? What narrative might they use (‘merit’, ‘scarcity’, ‘discipline’)?”

Encourage one realistic resource reallocation idea per group – even small (e.g. ensuring gender desk officers’ night work is recognised in rosters and allowances, not treated as invisible “extra”).

I – Impact

Goal: Train participants to think forward 12 months and look for disaggregated outcomes, not just intentions.

Exercise:

- Ask each person to imagine it is 12 months after their decision has been implemented.
- On three columns – Safer / More exposed / Lost trust – ask them to list which profiles fall where.

Facilitator questions:

- “Who is measurably safer because of this decision – name specific groups, not ‘everyone’.”
- “Who is more exposed to harm, stress, burnout, or disciplinary risk?”
- “Who has lost trust in the institution, or in you as a leader, because of how the decision landed?”
- “What evidence or data would you need to detect these patterns – complaints, attrition, sick leave, use of force incidents, community surveys, internal climate surveys? Are these data already disaggregated by gender, rank, ethnicity, age, disability, region?”

Ask one closing question:

- “Looking at your imagined impact table, does this decision leave structural inequality untouched, reinforce it, or begin to dismantle it – and what one change would move it toward dismantling?”

Running NAPRI+ as a live coaching exercise

- To make NAPRI+ concrete and participatory:
- Individual (10 minutes)
 - Each participant picks a real decision from their work (e.g. recent deployment, training selection, promotion board, disciplinary measure, new SOP) and fills in the NAPRI+ table in the workbook, focusing on WHAT.

Pairs (15 minutes)

- In pairs, they challenge each other to move from WHAT to WHY:
 - “You wrote that ‘women are under represented in this unit’ under Needs. Why? What structure, rule, or unwritten norm produces that pattern?”
 - “You wrote that ‘youth rarely complain through formal mechanisms’ under Access. Why? Which barrier is doing the work?”

Small groups or plenary (20 minutes)

- Each participant shares one letter where they discovered they usually stop at WHAT.

As facilitator, you emphasise:

“If your answer to every letter is ‘We will include women’, you haven’t used NAPRI+ yet. What is the WHY underneath? That is where change happens.”

Handling resistance around NAPRI+

Common resistance lines and suggested responses:

“We don’t have time for this.”

- “NAPRI+ can be a 10 minute check in existing meetings. The cost of not doing it is failed policies, unrest, and burnout. We are trying to make better use of the time and data you already have.”

“We treat everyone the same; that is fairness.”

- “The night shift and use of force case studies showed that ‘same treatment’ can produce very different risks and career paths depending on gender, caregiving, disability, neighbourhood or rank. NAPRI+ helps us see those patterns before they explode.”

“We already have gender in our plans; do we really need more?”

- “NAPRI+ keeps gender, but adds the realities that officers and communities face: poverty, language, rank, disability, minority status, migration. Ignoring these factors weakens both gender and operational outcomes.”
- Invite them to think of NAPRI+ as a tactical lens for smarter, more legitimate decisions – not as extra bureaucracy.
- Encourage participants to see NAPRI+ as a leadership habit rather than a one off tool.

General tips for learning and retention

To make the day stick:

- Cycle between short inputs, individual writing, pair work, and small group work to keep different learning styles engaged and to protect quieter voices.
- Use the same debrief prompts repeatedly so they become mental habits:
 - “What did you write that surprised you?”
 - “What is the smallest change that would shift this issue?”



DCAF Geneva Centre
for Security Sector
Governance