

SRMUN Atlanta 2017 Concurrent Crisis Addendum

This year at SRMUN Atlanta, delegates of NATO and the Security Council committees will have the unique experience of participating in a Concurrent Crisis. The idea originated from years of reoccurring requests by Security Council delegates who wished to gain intelligence from other committees during their crisis developments. In particular, NATO is the most common committee delegates wish to call on. This year, SRMUN has elected to allow both committees to participate and simultaneously respond to the same crisis scenario. This will greatly increase the scale and scope of the potential scenario and its outcomes. Our SRMUN staff members are confident that this will provide greater engagement opportunities for participating delegates.

Concurrent Crisis 101

I. Behind the Scenes

Your dais has worked to structure your committees in a balanced manner to be sure neither committee has an advantage over the other. Both committees will have equal time and opportunity to negotiate a peaceful, effective solution. Delegates will receive the very same intelligence at the very same time. The only information deemed to be legitimate is that which is delivered by your dais. Delegates will be challenged to participate in committee-wide caucuses, sometimes involving members of both NATO and the Security Council.

II. What to Expect

Once the crisis begins within each committee at the very same time, Member States should attempt to gather information, formulate a plan, and begin working on a viable solution. A viable solution considers the policy of the acting Member State and bears in mind the purview of their committee's mandate. Successful delegates will strive to collaborate with their allies, while also working to find common ground with Member States they are typically at odds with. However, delegates should be aware that the crisis will likely develop rapidly which might create a necessity for altering or even abandoning plans. Because of this, it is essential that delegates remain in character throughout the duration of simulation and practice diplomacy through respectful negotiation tactics to reflect the caliber of this challenge.

Although both NATO and the Security Council are separate bodies and independent of each other, both are capable of impacting the crisis scenario, and therefore, *collaboration and communication between the two committees will be vital to the success of this concurrent crisis*. It should be noted, however, that for the sake of realistic simulation, neither committee will have any over-arching powers within the other. Should the two bodies find themselves with opposing solutions to the crisis, it is the delegates' responsibility to resolve the issues. Without proper coordination, delegates may witness two of the world's most impactful organizations return unfavorable results for all involved.

It is important to keep in mind that although the Concurrent Crisis allows for various tools to be used during simulation, ultimately the SRMUN Rules of Procedure are still in effect and delegates should familiarize themselves with them prior to committee session.

III. Preparation

The concurrent crisis will require every delegate to possess a great deal of knowledge regarding their Member State's capabilities, policies, and politics. The following are specific areas that deserve extra attention during preparation:

- **Military:** Each delegate should be aware of their Member State's military capabilities. Force size (human capital), locations, range, and capabilities will all be important.
- **Economy:** Crucial imports, exports, and trade deals should be prioritized. Trade partners and current embargoes or sanctions should be considered.
- **Politics:** Military alliances, historical relations, potential partners, and general dispositions should be well known.

A thorough understanding of your Member State's policies will give you greater authority and awareness of key issues. It is up to you to find ways to leverage your Member State's objectives.

Tools for Delegate Interaction and Committee Simulation

IV. Updates

Updates are the committees' primary source of information regarding the development of the crisis scenario. They often come in the form of news articles, press releases, government reports, and military briefings. Updates are written by conference staff and the information within them should be considered accurate. However, depending on the source, they may include comments, assertions, or even propaganda from other Member States, which may not necessarily be an accurate portrayal of events.

Following the presentation of each update, committees will be allotted five to ten minutes to receive any needed clarifications from the conference staff in the form of a Question and Answer session (Q and A). After the allotted time has expired, delegates must rely on their deductive reasoning to arrive at realistic conclusions.

V. Home Government Action Request (HGAR)

A. Description

During the crisis simulation, delegates will have the opportunity to directly influence their Member State's response to the developing scenario through the use of a Home Government Action Request (HGAR). HGARs allow delegates to create changes, and

take actions that normally would be outside the realistic powers of a UN or NATO representative. Such actions could include mobilization and utilization of military forces, espionage and intelligence operations, press releases, communiques, economic support or sanctions, and more.

HGARs come in three levels of visibility: **Covert, Overt, and Normal**:

- **Covert** actions are taken with the goal of not being discovered by other Member States. However, it should be noted that a HGAR requested to be Covert may not necessarily remain hidden, depending on the requested action, other Member States' actions, and the developments of the crisis scenario.
- **Overt** actions are conducted with the explicit intent of being observed by other Member States. Overt actions will likely be included in an update for both committees.
- **Normal** actions are taken with no regard for whether or not they are observed. Depending on the action, it may be included in a committee update, or may go unannounced to the other Member States.

B. Procedure

All HGARs must be submitted on the HGAR template, which will be provided both electronically and by hard copy to all delegates prior to the crisis starting. At the end of each session, delegates will have an opportunity to submit **one** HGAR to the committee staff per committee session (submissions are in hard copy format)*. HGARs will be accepted no later than ten minutes following the suspension of the committee session, so it is recommended that delegates utilize strong time management in order to submit a HGAR that is considered on time.

*Please note - Member States with delegations in both NATO and Security Council can only submit a joint HGAR. These delegations are: France, Italy, United Kingdom, and United States of America. Member States with representation in both committees wishing to submit HGARs must have **joint approval** by both delegates, which will be proven by both delegates signing the HGAR form prior to submission. This is intended to balance the fact that some Member States do not have representation in both committees, and would be at a disadvantage if this rule were not in place.

A sample HGAR has been included at the end of this guide.

Following the end of the committee session, properly submitted HGARs will be reviewed by crisis staff for realism, feasibility, and appropriateness. HGARs deemed impossible, too far from a Member State's policies or capabilities, and/or otherwise inappropriate will be denied. Any Member State that submits a HGAR will be notified of their outcome

during the following session, either privately or with the rest of the committee via updates.

Please remember that many actions will take time to complete. Moving a carrier strike group across the ocean, mobilizing thousands of soldiers, and ratifying trade deals are all actions that take time. To account for this, an amount of simulated time ranging from hours to days will pass between each committee session. This passage of time will be included in updates presented at the start of each session.

Ultimate authority of all actions taken by all Member States lie with the crisis staff, who may approve, deny, and/or abandon any action for any reason they deem appropriate.

VI. Speaker Requests

During the course of the crisis simulation, it will be possible for committees to request an interview with a Member State of the other crisis committee (e.g. NATO wishes to formally interview the Chinese delegate to the Security Council). The purpose of these interviews is to gain information regarding the position of other Member States, working papers in a committee, or the disposition of a committee as a whole.

Delegates wishing to request an interview must first approach their dais with the request. The requesting committee's Director will then notify their counterpart, who will then ask the requested delegate if they wish to participate in this interview. Throughout this request process, if either Director denies the request, or the requested speaker declines the invitation, the interview will not happen. Once approved, the interview will last no longer than 15 minutes, and the requested speaker may choose to leave at any time.

VII. Joint Caucuses

Throughout the crisis, there will be opportunities for both committees to hold informal caucuses together, for the purpose of collaborating, and updating each other on progress being made within each committee. Committee Directors will determine when such a time is appropriate or if necessary, and request a motion for a suspension of the meeting be made. Should the committees' informal caucuses overlap, delegates are welcome to intermingle for the sake of inter-committee collaboration. Although it is recommended that delegates interact with their counterparts, it is in no way required. Moderated caucuses involving both committees will not be allowed.

The goal of these joint unmoderated caucuses is to assist both committees' efforts to produce resolutions that will provide coordinated solutions to the crisis. Although the resolutions do not have to be identical, nor are they expected to be, it would be in the interest of all involved if they proved to be complimentary, or at least avoided conflicting recommendations to the issue.

VIII. Voting

For the purposes of voting, SRMUN Rules of Procedure will remain in place to be consistent across the conference's committees and to ensure transparency. When voting on a draft resolution, both bodies will vote in the traditional way that their committees do (all **NATO** decisions are made by **consensus**, after discussion and consultation among member countries so, delegates should strive to pass draft resolutions in this same manner. Somewhat similar, the Security Council requires nine affirmative votes total, and no veto from any of the five permanent members). Ideally, if there is opposition to a draft resolution, delegates will coordinate discussion to facilitate a positive outcome prior to moving to a vote.

IX. Awards

Position paper, delegate and delegation awards are based on the same criteria as all other committees at SRMUN Atlanta. Please refer to the Delegate Resource Guide for additional information on awards.