**PROJECT *(Sample based on program to establish political think-tanks in countries with closed political systems)***

**Risk Analysis**

|  | Description of Risk | Likelihood  | Potential Impact of Risk | Risk Mitigation Plan |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ProgramRisks | Civil society partners experience an increasingly restrictive operating environment:* Members of think tanks and CSOs are monitored or harassed.
* Think tanks are pressured to stop working in COUNTRY.
* CSOs are pressured to stop advocacy initiatives.
 | Med-High | * Project partners experience physical or digital threats.
* Disruption of think tank research.
* Disruption of advocacy campaigns.
 | GRANTEE will maintain close communications with partners in COUNTRY. If intimidation, monitoring, and harassment of civil society increases, GRANTEE will take action on an increasing scale appropriate with the threat. Responses may include: * Providing physical/digital security training for project partners
* Alerting international representatives, including DRL, Embassies, EU, etc.
* Working with think tanks to modify work plans
* Working with CSOs to redesign advocacy to shift to tactics that pose the least risk to participants
* Connecting partners to GRANTEE Emergency Assistance Funds, which provide financial, material, and security assistance to individuals or organizations
* Providing training or follow-up support in a different location or through secure digital connections
 |
| SUB-GRANTEE and PARTNER are not easily accepted by government as objective think tanks. | Med | Think tank policy research is viewed as biased and disregarded by government officials. | GRANTEE will draw on its long history of supporting think tank development and the expertise of its Research and Publications team to advise think tanks on steps they can take to establish themselves as independent credible sources of policy research. GRANTEE will assist think tanks in producing high-quality research and will use its in-country connections to facilitate linkages with government officials.  |
| The elections result in a new set of elected officials and a possible shift in power. | High | Government policies and representatives change during the project period. | Development of think tank stakeholder assessments and communication plans will occur after election results are clear. Plans for advocacy campaigns will be finalized after the elections to ensure they reflect the new political landscape. |
| Government officials are hesitant to engage on issues that raise questions of accountability for marginalized populations. | Med | Direct engagement with government officials is limited or government is unwilling to take action. | GRANTEE and its partners will leverage current relationships with government to facilitate direct engagement between CSOs and relevant government officials. Advocacy training for CSOs will include units on conducting government stakeholder analyses, strategies for targeted communication and trust building with government, and creating broad coalitions to strengthen advocacy initiatives.  |
| Financial Risks | GRANTEE is unable to transfer funds to local partners (at all or in a timely manner).  | Med | Potential delays in the implementation of project activities | GRANTEE will identify alternate intermediary banks or intermediary payment methods as necessary to ensure project funds reach local partners. If necessary, funds can be received and distributed by GRANTEE in-country staff or current Burmese partners that can receive international wire transfers. |
| Advocacy CSOs have low capacity to manage small grants | Low | Potential delays in the implementation of advocacy campaigns or reporting | GRANTEE will vet capacity of local partners before awarding financial support. GRANTEE will also work closely with local partners to provide financial training and support. |