***All these scenarios are based on real experiences but any details are purely fictitious.***

* **Scenario 1**

*Brother Rex has only ever experienced a tropical climate, first in his village, and then in Honiara where he is now one of the senior members of the Melanesian Brotherhood. When he visited Australia as part of a visit to a parish in Brisbane he was shocked to see scantily-clad people featured in Australian advertising.*

*Going south to Melbourne in the winter allowed Br Rex to see snow for the first time in his life. He stayed with a family for five days before going to Darwin. Coming from Melanesia, he was used to sleeping on flax mats. Though his hosts had made up a warm comfortable bed for him he slept, fully clothed, on top of it although he did remove some of the pillows. His hosts kept talking about an ‘electric blanket’ but he had no idea what this meant.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What are the issues?** | **What could have been done differently?** |
| Different Advertising values between Honiara and Brisbane | * Pre-visit briefing |
| ? Visitor being afraid to ask a question | * Hosts may have needed to tell Fr Rex to ask questions |
| ? Hosts not explaining things | * A briefing on arrival at the home |
| Safety of electric blanket | * Either remove it or have a briefing – could have been left on for days if turned on by hosts! |

* **Scenario 2**

*Two bishops, one Scandinavian, the other Australian, had originally met at theological college together, as part* of a student exchange and they had kept in touch for many years by way of annual Christmas cards. When *they met at an international liturgical conference in Sydney in 2009 their friendship was reinvigorated. After an evening’s discussion they decided to form a companion link relationship between their dioceses and they signed a partnership agreement to that effect. Quite soon after the signing, the Australian bishop was forced to retire following a stroke. A couple of months later, the bishop of the Scandinavian diocese was elected to be the Archbishop of the province and she left her original diocese.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What are the issues?** | **What could have been done differently?** |
| The partnership appears to be little more than the bishops’ friendship | * More people ought to have been involved |
| No people were appointed to be work as a communications channel between the dioceses | * Communications people appointed to exchange stories between each of the dioceses |

* **Scenario 3**

*The mission team at a Tasmanian parish were thrilled that fifty-seven people wanted to travel to visit their partner in the Church of the Province of the Indian Ocean for a week. What they didn’t realise was that such a large group would force the islanders into either taking far more visitors that they were able to deal with or into an admission (for them one that would be extremely shameful) that they were unable to take such a big group. The islanders felt caught between a rock and a hard place. What’s more, they were already exhausted after the missions trip of the Kiwi teenagers.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What are the issues?** | **What could have been done differently?** |
| Timing – too many visits at once | * A different time needs to have been thought about |
| Unrealistic expectations of Australians – we can be accommodated anywhere, anytime | * Expectations need to be tempered by the reality of the islanders’ ability to accommodate visitors |
| No understanding of concept of shame/saving face | * Visitors may be going too early in the relationship … do they really know the islanders well? |

* **Scenario 4**

*The mission team at a church in rural Australia were really excited about the visit of a deacon from their parish partner, based in Eastern Europe. They wanted him to experience everything their parish had to offer, and they wanted him to feel at home. When Deacon Alexei arrived he discovered an exhausting schedule and that his hosts wanted to talk to him till late in the evenings. As English isn’t his first language this was a gruelling experience for him – he felt like a performing seal. Added to the non-stop activity during the days the whole visit left Deacon Alexei no time for relaxation, let alone reflection. At the end of the two-week visit he felt utterly exhausted and sick.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What are the issues?** | **What could have been done differently?** |
| Unrealistic expectations projected on to visitors | * A better timetable with space for reflection or a longer visit * Do they really want him to feel at home? |
| Language issues | * Briefings being provided in the deacon’s language * Translator used, if possible * (? Learning some of the deacon’s language – a longer-term task) * NB – it always seems the partner is required to speak in English whether at home or in Australia |

* **Scenario 5**

*About a decade ago a parish in New South Wales was really keen to be in a relationship with a partner in South Asia. The parish was helped to find a partner by some ex-missionaries who had worked in the area in the late 1960s. At first things went fairly slowly, but communications became far more regular and meaningful after a visit by the Australian parish priest and a couple of parishioners. Soon after the initial visit a funding request came through to the Australians which sought financial support for medical supplies for their local clinic. The Australians thought that this was a great idea and had some fundraising events which were successful. In the end, they were able to send around $47,000 over a five-year period.*

*In the sixth year the Australians made a second trip to South Asia and were looking forward to hearing from the nurse in charge of the clinic how their funds had been spent. However, when they arrived they found that the nurse in charge had not seen any of the funds. After much discussion and investigation it turned out that a former leader in the parish had unilaterally decided that the parish youths should be given half of the funds for musical instruments, and that the rest should be spent on a new car, of which he was the sole driver. The youths had all gone from the parish to study in a larger town, taking their instruments with them, and the former leader had driven off in the car when he retired.*

*The Australians were very upset that no medical supplies had been purchased and they wondered how they would break the news to the others back home, many of whom were retired nurses. They felt duped that they’d been fundraising for things they didn’t think were of any value to the sick who attended the medical clinic.*

*What the Australians discovered ruined their relationship with the overseas parish and left the health clinic staff there feeling angry and depressed.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What are the issues?** | **What could have been done differently?** |
| No evidence of a signed agreement regarding the project | * An agreement should have been signed or the project funded through a mission organization |
| Unapproved conduct committed (? knowingly) by parish leader | * An agreement should have specified at least two people (e.g. parish leader and nurse in charge of the clinic) were responsible for receipting funds and spending them on the hospital, not on other projects. * Approval for budget variance should have been sought. |
| Dishonest conduct that benefitted himself committed (knowingly) by parish leader | * no ability to sell car and get funds back once car has gone |
| Unapproved conduct committed (? knowingly) by students | * Students should have been told instruments needed to remain in their parish – they were not personal gifts |
| No evidence of communications or monitoring of project | * A regular communications channel would perhaps have alerted the Australians to the problem. * Monitoring should have been done if parish could afford it * Or the project funded through a mission organization who could have monitored it |
| Levels of mistrust and disappointment between dioceses are high – the relationship is now toxic | * An agreement would have laid out policies and procedures for the project, and for addressing grievances. * Given the toxicity of the relationship it would either end or go back to being a relational one. * Funding can kill a decent relationship. |

* **Scenario 6**

*Because of a long-standing civil war overseas, an Australian diocese has a number of refugee families living in it. The diocese has begun ministering to the refugee community by ordaining and/or licensing some clergy from among them and having worship in the appropriate languages, as well as youth activities. Because of this link, a team from the Australian diocese travels to the refugees’ home country. The Australian team has some expertise in schools (there are a couple of teachers among the team). Because many of the refugees now living in Australia come from a particular town in the overseas country, the team wants to erect a secondary school there. When the Australians meet with the bishop and the diocesan education commission they are listened to politely and both the bishop and the diocesan health education staff tell the Australians that the town already has two secondary schools, whereas another town in the neighbouring diocese has no secondary school at all.*

*Moreover, the Australians are also told that in the town with the two secondary schools there is no health clinic and that is the main need in that place as patients have to walk for five hours a day to and from the closest medical centre. Some people have died going to the medical centre because it is so far away.*

*When the Australians return home they decide to go ahead with adding a secondary school to the town that has two already. They send over a team who builds a school on some parish land. Months later, the Australian bishop is concerned because she has received a letter from the overseas bishop which makes it clear that there are not enough students or teachers in the town to run secondary schools and that what has been built is standing there vacant. The Australian bishop had been led to believe by her team that the secondary school was what the overseas partner wanted, but this wasn’t the case.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What are the issues?** | **What could have been done differently?** |
| Australians not listening to the priorities of the local diocese | Attention to the fact that another secondary school was not needed there, whereas a medical centre was |
| Australians not listening to the priorities of the national church | A secondary school could have been built in the neighbouring diocese |
| Australian bishop was not involved in project | More episcopal involvement |
| Australian bishop was misled by her team | More episcopal involvement would have not allowed this to happen |
| A waste of resources – building a ‘white elephant’ | Wise use of resources |
| No empowerment of local workers | Locals being employed or trained to build the buildings |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Australian Provinces/Dioceses** | **Companion Diocese(s) ‘Registered’ with the Anglican Communion Office** |
| **Extra-Provincial** |  |
| * Tasmania | * *None listed* |
| **New South Wales** |  |
| * Armidale | * North Kigezi (Church of Uganda) |
| * Bathurst | * *None listed* |
| * Canberra and Goulburn | * Wellington (Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia) |
| * Grafton | * *None listed* |
| * Newcastle | * Newcastle (Church of England) |
| * Riverina | * *None listed* |
| * Sydney | * *None listed* |
| **Queensland** |  |
| * Brisbane | * *None listed* |
| * North Queensland | * The Arctic (Anglican Church of Candada) |
| * The Northern Territory | * *None listed* |
| * Rockhampton | * Llandaff (Church in Wales) * Popondota (Anglican Church of PNG) |
| **South Australia** |  |
| * Adelaide | * *None listed* |
| * The Murray | * Popondota (Anglican Church of PNG) |
| * Willochra | * *None listed* |
| **Victoria** |  |
| * Ballarat | * Aipo-Rongo (Anglican Church of PNG) |
| * Bendigo | * *None listed* |
| * Gippsland | * Gahini  (Province de L'Eglise Anglicane au Rwanda) |
| * Melbourne | * *None listed* |
| * Wangaratta | * *None listed* |
| **Western Australia** |  |
| * Bunbury | * Dogura (Anglican Church of PNG) |
| * North West Australia | * Meru (Anglican Church of Kenya) * Temotu (SI, Anglican Church of Melanesia) |
| * Perth | * Umzimbuvu  (Anglican Church of Southern Africa) |