

## FACILITATOR GUIDE

### SUMMARY

---

You will need the game, and some post-its and pens. The game should be fairly self-explanatory. The main facilitation issues are making sure everyone gets a chance to speak and keeping to time. For keeping to time: if discussions are getting heated or long, “park” the topic on a post-it and reassure participants that it will be discussed further in the plenary.

### VARIATION 1: BUILD A FUTURE STAGE (~10 mins)

---

Facilitation is minimal: written instructions are provided in the box. Some points to note:

- Water shocks don't have to be what the team predicts would be most likely in the scenario – rather, they should be things the team would be interested to see the response to
- The goal is to make things “interesting” in both senses of the word for the other team
- Players might be tempted to include non-water-related shocks using the blank cards. Gently remind them that water is the focus of the workshop. If they insist that the shock is tenuously water-related they can still use it, but try and avoid mention of Brexit and other very distracting non-water topics.

### VARIATION 2: BUILD A STRATEGY STAGE (~15 mins)

---

- If the players have difficulty starting, suggest they look at what is already there and change anything they don't like.
- Emphasise that the most useful discussion will probably happen in the Stress-Testing, so this strategy doesn't have to be perfect.
- If people are worried about what they develop being compatible with the Future, reassure them that this will happen next.
- It is interesting but not essential for players to represent at least one actor they know well.
- Try to avoid players having two actors from the same sector (same colour)



Part of the project “Increasing the resilience of the UK fresh fruit and veg system to water-related risk”, funded through the Global Food Security’s ‘Resilience of the UK Food System Programme’, with support from BBSRC, ESRC, NERC and Scottish Government.

## BASIC ROUND (~5 mins per round)

---

### Event happens

Try to give each round around 5 minutes. Many rounds will take less time than this, but you can use a timer as an excuse to move on if things are getting bogged down.

- On the first round the players may struggle with where to start the black cubes, making leaps like “in a drought prices will go up” and putting them straight on the price. Encourage them to make the smallest steps possible (first the grower will be affected etc): that way there will be space to think through the chains of events properly.
- There will be many places a person could choose to place a shock (any one of many farmers could be affected). Encourage variety so the same storyline isn't repeated. It can help here to point out that if an actor has a lot of black cubes they may react differently than they did previously.

### Group reaction

- If players ask about what to aim for, remind them they are competing against the other table. There is no one winner but we will be comparing the tables, so for example the person representing a particular actor here will want to have fewer cubes than their counterpart. Also think about the island as a whole: is the system resilient (for example, a concentration of cubes on one actor might indicate a weak link)?
- Players should be reminded the story will be read out in plenary, this should discourage them from doing anything too silly.
- Players can completely remove a cube from the game – however, this should only be done if it seems realistic that the actor could completely neutralise the shock with no negative impacts on others.
- Try to stick to the timer – this will give everyone an equal chance to participate and ensure the tables both finish at similar times.
- Encourage people to challenge anything they think is unrealistic and call a vote if the table is divided.
- Players can challenge an *unrealistic* action but not an *undesirable* one.



Part of the project “Increasing the resilience of the UK fresh fruit and veg system to water-related risk”, funded through the Global Food Security’s ‘Resilience of the UK Food System Programme’, with support from BBSRC, ESRC, NERC and Scottish Government.

### DEBRIEF (IN GROUPS)

---

What trade-offs were identified between resilience actions by different actors?

How did the system respond? Did actions prevent shocks from happening (robustness), remove them (robustness/recovery) or change the configuration of the system itself (reorganisation)?

### COMPARE

---

After the game, look at number and distribution of blocks. What were the key differences between groups?

After a few rounds you can give a **prize** to Most Resilient System, Most Resilient Grower, Most Environmentally-Friendly System, Most Evil Future, Most Friendly Future etc.

### DEBRIEF (IN PLENARY)

---

Note-takers should give a light-hearted account of the happenings at each table when the groups report in plenary on what happened.

Compare and contrast the outcomes chosen by the various groups. How did these affect the strategy chosen by the group? How did it affect the number of cubes? After the game, does the group think they represent "good"? Would the tables have done as well if they had used the other table's outcomes?

Then, go through the cubes left on each table at the end of the game. How is the distribution? How did that distribution come about? Is that distribution "good"? For whom?

Was there one configuration which did well in all the futures? If so, why?

Which futures were desirable or least desirable? Which futures were most probably or improbable?



Part of the project "Increasing the resilience of the UK fresh fruit and veg system to water-related risk", funded through the Global Food Security's 'Resilience of the UK Food System Programme', with support from BBSRC, ESRC, NERC and Scottish Government.