



Exercise Behavioural Observation

Goal of the exercise: reacting to possible red flags

Lessons learned:

- Different departments need to cooperate and share concerns, observations, and any other relevant information;
- Information must be gathered;
- Small pieces of information can indicate a possible threat;
- Procedures must be put in place to handle information;
- The conversation with the person is necessary, but some training may be needed;
- Culture has a big impact on how a reaction is analysed.

EXERCISE (60min)

Explanation exercise (3 mins)

Outline : Participants will be divided into 6 different groups. Each group will receive a specific role in a hypothetical facility. We ask that each group relates this exercise as much as possible to their own work environment.

In the role that the group has been given, they will look at a specific person, named Anthony, working in the same facility. Based on the information you receive (from yourself or added by others), the group will reflect on certain questions and everyone will be able to decide for themselves if further actions need to be taken or not.

It is important that the exercise is played out in the reality of the participant. (S)he should try to look at the signs as if it was happening in his/her own organisation with their own legal background.

Known by the entire participants group:

General bio of Anthony: Anthony has a good profile, who is somewhat overqualified for the function he is currently in. Anthony was one of many candidates for this job, but somehow was able to convince the hiring committee that he was best fit for the job. He didn't come from the same sector, but has good credentials. During the recruitment process Anthony had a social attitude and was very open to everyone.

Once hired, he was first delivering and achieving his potential and working in the technical areas of the facility. However, his good performance did not last for long. We have no concrete information on this family situation. After about 8 months, a new job was proposed to Anthony, which is more suitable for his credentials and higher salary (but is more in administrative buildings with less access to the technical areas), the person declined the new position and his behavior and output started to change. He is very quiet and seems very tired lately, but you seem to see him everywhere you go. He is always walking around in different areas of the facility.

General noticeable changes:

- Anthony was seen in areas that he shouldn't have access to.
- He is not open about his personal life.

Unknown by the participants group:

Insider adversary? Anthony is looking at information concerning the job he was recruited for. If the job changes, his work will be more the administrative areas with less possibilities to walk around in the facility and his access will be limited.



Not an adversary (green): He has always been fascinated by nuclear technology, he now has a job where he is working in technical areas, and he does not want to give that up. Also, his child has been sick for a couple of weeks, nothing serious, but because of his child's sickness, Anthony has not been sleeping well.

Potential adversary (yellow): He already knows the basics of the facility because of his interest in the facility itself. He likes the job he has because it is very practical. He had also heard from a friend that there is sensitive information, and he is curious to what it is. It would be nice if he has such information, you never know what you could do with it. On the other hand, his child has been sick for a couple of weeks, nothing serious, but because of his child's sickness, Anthony has not been sleeping well.

Adversary (red): He was intentionally moved in the facility as a mole for a malicious organization. He is providing intel to this organization on a weekly basis.

Practical:

- Create ppt to explain the exercise

Part 1: The participants are divided into 6 different groups. The groups have been selected in advance, to make sure we have different backgrounds and cultures in every group. Every group receives one of the 6 roles as defined below and receives an additional part of information next to the general profile. Each group should be guided by a teacher (someone who can guide the conversation and note the train of thought in general).

At the end of the discussion the answers to the Mentimeter questions to all participants will guide the rest of the exercise. It is very important to relate this information back to the reality of the participants. They need to imagine the situation in their daily job.

Different roles/6 groups:

- A. HR:
 - a. General information on Anthony: He is somewhat overqualified for the function. He was hired because there was a possible job opening at "the right" level, which he was made aware of. Anthony has a partner and 1 child who is still a minor.
 - b. Possible red flag: The new position was presented with a higher salary to Anthony but he declined. No reasons were given.
- B. Security department:
 - a. General information on Anthony: He is following security protocols but does not have a proactive attitude.



- b. Possible red flag: One day there was an incident with a co-worker. Anthony was a witness of this incident, but he did not want to come forward in order to help the investigation.
- C. Direct colleague:
 - a. General information on Anthony: He is very reserved on his private life. Don't even know if there is a partner/kids.
 - b. Possible red flag: He has no social connection with any of his colleagues.
- D. Line manager/direct supervisor:
 - a. General information on Anthony: He is working long hours (comes in early), including working from home during weekends and access to digital files.
 - b. Possible red flag: The output of this work is not showing whilst according to HR he should be overqualified for the job.
- E. Security guard:
 - a. General information on Anthony: Anthony's profile does not ring a bell.
 - b. Possible red flag: Anthony stays under the radar.
- F. Colleague from a different department:
 - a. General information on Anthony: This colleague from this department saw Anthony twice in his section, we don't know why he was there.
 - b. Possible red flag: The colleague didn't know the individual had access to that part and is not sure he is supposed to have access.

Discussion points: (15 mins)

- What do you think of this piece of information;
- What could it mean : insider adversary/ not an insider adversary;
- Would you do something and how would you react;
- What could be the outcome if you DO something;
- What could be the outcome if you DON'T DO something;
- Who would you talk to, to have more information;
- What actions might have prevented Anthony to be in this position (pre employment, vetting,...)?
- Why would you react or not?

Menti Questions to the whole group: (2 mins)

- Is this information something to worry about? Y/N
- Would you take further action? Y/N
- Which action and prioritise:
 - Gather more information
 - Take measures directly
 - Talk to the person itself
- To gather more information: Which role would you want to talk to first (prioritise)? Would you notice this behaviour in your organisation? (very much depending on the piece of information you have)
- Would there be a possibility to report this information easily in your organisation?



Practical:

- Divide participants in 6 different groups
- Foresee paper with information to be given to the group
- Foresee 6 teachers/notetakers
- Create Menti questions

Part 2: Based on the answers on the Mentimeter question ‘Which role would you want to talk to first’, the information of this role will be made available to the whole group (by the teacher of this group). The information of this role would therefore be added to the information already known by the 5 other groups. The individuals of the group of the role that has been made public will be added to the remaining 5 groups to discuss this new information.

At the end of the discussion the answers to the Mentimeter questions to the whole group will guide the rest of the exercise. It is very important to relate this information back to the reality of the participants. They need to imagine the situation in their daily job.

Example of the group division:

- ➔ It was decided that the information of the security guard (role E) will be made public.
- ➔ The teacher of role E explains the information on the paper they received in the beginning of the exercise and provides a short resumé of their conclusions
- ➔ The participants of group E are divided into the remaining groups A, B, C, D and F

Discussion points: (15 mins)

- What do you think of this piece of information;
- What could it mean : insider adversary/ not an insider adversary;
- Would you do something and how would you react;
- What could be the outcome if you DO something;
- What could be the outcome if you DON'T DO something;
- Who would you talk to, to have more information?
- Why would you react or not?

Menti Questions to the whole group: (2 mins)

- Compared to the information you had previously and when adding this new information (extra role), is this situation something to worry about? Y/N
- Would you take further action? Y/N
- Which action and prioritise:
 - Gather more information
 - Take measures directly
 - Talk to the person itself
- To gather more information: Which role would you want to talk to first (prioritise)? Would you notice this behaviour this in your organisation? (very much depending on the piece of information you have)
- Would there be a possibility to report this information easily in your organisation?



Practical:

- Create menti questions

Part 3: Based on the answers on the Mentimeter question 'Which role would you want to talk to first', the information of this role will be made known to the whole group (by the teacher of this group). The information of this role would therefore be added to the information already known by the 4 other individual groups. The individuals of the group of the role that has been made public will be added to the last 4 groups to again discuss the new information.

At the end of the discussion the answers to the Mentimeter questions to the whole group will guide the rest of the exercise. It is very important to relate this information back to the reality of the participants. They need to imagine it in their daily job.

Example of the group division:

- ➔ It was decided that the information of HR (role A) will be made public.
- ➔ The teacher of role E explains the information on the paper they received in the beginning of the exercise and provides a short resumé of their conclusions in the meantime
- ➔ The participants of group A are divided into the existing groups B, C, D and F (E was already divided into the other groups)

Discussion points: (15 mins)

- What do you think of this piece of information;
- What could it mean : insider adversary/ not an insider adversary;
- Would you do something and how would you react;
- What could be the outcome if you DO something;
- What could be the outcome if you DON'T DO something;
- Who would you talk to, to have more information?
- Why would you react or not?

Menti Questions to the whole group: (2 mins)

- Compared to the information you had previously and when adding this new information (extra role), is this situation something to worry about? Y/N
- Would you take further action? Y/N
- Which action and prioritise:
 - Gather more information
 - Take measures directly
 - Talk to the person itself
- To gather more information: Which role would you want to talk to first (prioritise)?
- Would you notice this behaviour this in your organisation? (very much depending on the piece of information you have)



- Would there be a possibility to report this information easily in your organisation?

Practical:

- Create Menti questions



RESULTS (30min)

Explanation exercise

All signs are made available to everyone. We have a small group discussion, before asking again some Mentimeter questions to gain a general response.

Group Discussion (5min):

- Does this change your way of handling?
- What could it mean : insider adversary/ not an insider adversary;
- Would you do something and how would you react;
- What could be the outcome if you DO something;
- What could be the outcome if you DON'T DO something;
- Who best suited to talk to the person?
- Why would you react or not?
- If you would have decided not to talk to Anthony after the first piece of information, would you have missed a potential insider?

Menti Questions to the whole group: (2 mins)

- Would you take immediate steps without talking to the person? Y/N
- Would you talk to the person? Y/N
- Which role is best suited to talk to the person?

Actor play: Based on the outcome of the Mentimeter questions. A specific role will be chosen to have a talk with Anthony. We ask for a volunteer from the participants who will play out the conversation with Anthony (played by actor).

- ➔ We try to do this play at least 2 times. Every time the participant steps into the play with his own reality, background and culture. In every play it is decided in advance if the actor is no adversary – possible adversary – adversary (this is only made public to the group after the conversation).

Practical:

- Create ppt with all signs and possible outcomes (no adversary – possible adversary – adversary)
- Create Menti questions

POSSIBLE ELABORATION OF THE EXERCISE

This exercise is a good start to generate discussions or a coaching part in how to hold such interviews.

In this part, you can find some suggestions from the group to build on the existing exercise and to elaborate the exercise itself or the coaching part after the exercise.

Changing the profile

There are many possibilities to change the profile in this exercise and adapt it more into the reality of the participants.

Possibilities for changes:

- Create a female profile
- Create a profile looking specifying an age
- Create a profile where there are red flags

Next steps

Interviewing techniques:

The exercise can be the start on a teaching moment on interviewing techniques or the recognition of micro expressions. Specific presentations or workshop could help the discussion afterwards.

There is also a possibility to tape the interviews that were held during the exercise. In order to evaluate the reaction step by step.

How to assess a threat:

The exercise can also be a starting point on further discussion on the assessment of 'red flags'.

Play out different scenarios

With more rooms and time available, the exercise can be played out in different scenarios.

Where there are groups that have a conversation with the actor earlier in the process if they would like to see his reaction.

The group that does have a conversation can also build further on his reactions during the interview. This would mean you need to foresee different scenarios and possibilities to split the group. Afterwards, it would be interesting to see if the conversation has guided the actions of the players.

Possibilities to share and compare hypothesis within the play

This is generally done within the smaller groups, but not between groups. When you have more time for the exercise, this is an addition that can be done during the play. In order to compare what the



possible outcomes are, the differences in reaction towards the person might come forward even more clear.

Setting the scene

Depending on the group, it might also be useful to really set the scene with a specific legal framework. If there are people from different countries, they bring their legal framework in the exercise. If you want to look at cultural differences, this aspects needs to be taken into account.