

Background on NGT

Nominal Group Technique (NGT) was developed in the 1970s as a structured brainstorming technique to solicit feedback from a group of stakeholders. The approach was intended as an evaluation method to provide semi-quantitative, rank ordered feedback from group participants.¹ NGT has been used in several settings as a multi-stage consensus building process whereby participants are given a scenario to solicit brainstorming. Additional information on NGT can be found [here](#).

Typically, NGT is not structured around a specific case; however, NGT was adapted for the purpose of systems building in preventing violent extremism to include a guiding case. Therefore, the NGT presented here is referred to as Scenario Based-NGT (SB-NGT).

The SB-NGT has been designed to initiate conversations related to designing more integrated systems to prevent targeted violence. Participants are first asked to identify the challenges posed by the scenario with potential to escalate into an act of targeted violence, and second to identify the functions that an integrated system will need to perform to address the challenges posed by the system, considering current resources available to the system. Below are definitions of system, challenges, functions, and resources that guide this approach:

System refers to all public, private, and voluntary entities that contribute to the delivery of services related to the prevention of targeted violence within a jurisdiction.

Challenges therefore, are defined as issues encountered during a specific situation that a system must be able to address.

Functions are actions a system must be capable of doing to address the aforementioned challenges.

Resources were not a topic of discussion in this particular exercise but refer to the capacities the system must have to execute the functions necessary to address the challenges posed by a given situation.

¹ Delbecq, Andre L., and Andrew H. Van de Ven. "A group process model for problem identification and program planning." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 7.4 (1971): 466-492.