Workshop Outcomes
World Humanitarian Summit: Regional Business Consultation

July 2015, Auckland
Businesses who have undertaken work in the humanitarian field came together on 29 June 2015 with representatives from the not-for-profit and governmental sectors to explore how the business sector is contributing to humanitarian action in the Pacific Region.

Participants were asked to describe what types of activities they were undertaking, where they were focusing their energy, what they wanted and what they got from participating in humanitarian work. Key issues were identified and the group worked to come up with potential solutions to these issues.

This report presents the findings from this workshop. The purpose of this paper is to better understand what is happening, provide commentary around our practice and identify gaps and opportunities.
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Humanitarian Action and Private Sector Contribution

Introduction

Businesses predominately from New Zealand and Australia were invited to participate in a consultation event co-hosted by Deloitte New Zealand and The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in June 2015. Businesses were identified and invited if they had historically contributed to humanitarian action in the Pacific. Over 45 participants attended, 30 from the private sector representing 23 businesses. The remainder of the participants represented government department and non-governmental organisations who are undertaking humanitarian work.

Opened by Dr Jemilah Mahmood, the Chief of the World Humanitarian Summit Secretariat, the workshop included a range of activities to better understand how the businesses were currently contributing to humanitarian action, the key issues in those contributions and what future activity might look like.

Type of Activities

The private sector has the skills, resources, networks, innovative practices and expertise to help reduce humanitarian organisations’ overhead and delivery costs and create significant impact on the ground. The degree to which this has been leveraged, however, varied across the businesses in attendance.

Participants cited a range of ways in which they currently contribute to humanitarian action. These are listed below in order of frequency of activity:

- Providing services, predominately in kind, that utilise the business’s skills and expertise in a way that is adjacent (or beside) to what the organisation does on a day to day basis. An example of this is utilising people’s skills in telecommunication technology to support a country to re-establish communications after a disaster.
- Providing funding, donations of goods or fundraising support to NGOs. In a couple of cases this also included supporting rebuilding efforts through volunteering time and resources.
- Providing services or product, predominately in kind, for humanitarian efforts that are the business’s core product or service (for example, an airline offering flights to transport humanitarian workers). In the graph below this is labelled ‘bread and butter’.
- Organisations that were in the business of providing humanitarian products or services within a for-profit model. In these cases humanitarian action is the market to which these business supply their products or services. In the graph below this is labelled ‘core business’.
- Playing a coordination role by getting other businesses involved and supporting their humanitarian action.
- Supporting NGOS to build capability.
- Supporting staff that were affected by the disaster.

The graph below highlights the frequency of each activity.

---

1 Businesses were identified through either being discussed in published media or through consultation with leading NGOs in the humanitarian field. In the majority of cases businesses were met with or spoken to before the event to ascertain their level of contribution to humanitarian action.

2 There was only one case where the business in attendance had not engaged in humanitarian action in the past.
“Adjacent” and “Bread and Butter” activities were common. These are activities which utilise the business expertise (skills and knowledge) to support humanitarian activity. Reflection on recent research reports on sustainability and corporate social responsibility in New Zealand and Australia suggests that this approach is a more progressive way in which to contribute to the humanitarian sector. A model published by Harvard Business School outlines the development of sustainability initiatives and sustainability staffing ranging from:

- Initiator (the first stage of sustainability activity focused on compliance);
- Integrator (looking for ways to integrate into and across the business to leverage business and find efficiencies); and,
- Innovator (taking a proactive and transformational approach to building strategic sustainability).

Compared to how businesses are contributing to other areas of environmental or social development in New Zealand, this group had lesser emphasis on providing philanthropic donations or fundraising efforts and a greater focus on the ways in which they could leverage their business expertise to improve humanitarian activity (moving into a more integrated model).

Conversely, utilising business expertise (skills and knowledge) to build the capability of the sector as a whole or to coordinate the efforts of others within or across the sector was less common. While it was recognised that great work was being done by the businesses within the ecosystem, the degree to which this was coordinated or the degree to which institutions and organisations knew what businesses were doing was low.

**Timing of Activities**

Participants were presented with a popular humanitarian framework which outlines the stages of humanitarian action from preparing for disaster, responding to a disaster and assisting the region to recover. Participants were asked firstly to identify in which stage their activities fall and secondly where activities should optimally fall.

Across all respondents, including business, government or NGO, it was recognized that optimally the greatest amount of activity should be placed on preparedness (45%) followed by response (30%) and then recovery (25%). The activities taken across the participants, including the not-for-profit and governmental organisations roughly matched where it was articulated that emphasis should optimally go.
Within the business sector, however, greater action was taken in Response (with 50% of the recorded activity being in response to a disaster) with lesser activity taken to support the recovery of a community or region (14%).

Limitations in the preparedness, response and recovery model were highlighted, recognising that the model represented more of a continuum of activity than discrete activities. It was also highlighted there is a relationship between how we work with communities to prepare, respond and recover from disasters and community development. From this perspective, the way in which we undertake preparedness and recovery activity can build sustainable and empowered communities.

Should businesses engage more in recovery and how could that support community development?
Issues for Private Sector Contribution

It was recognised that the business sector had greater skills, expertise and resources than what was currently being leveraged in humanitarian action in the Pacific. There were a number of issues limiting how and when the private sector contributed to humanitarian action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad-hoc contribution requested when disaster strikes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many of the private-sector respondents recognised that they have engaged in humanitarian action through ad hoc engagements, without long standing partnerships with NGO or governments. Businesses are not consulted during the development response plans or provision or preparedness activity and are only approached when disasters strike, with little lead in time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses struggle to respond to NGO or governmental need with short-term notice. The preferred method was for business to plan and budget for activity in advance. This may have contributed to whether businesses contribute to humanitarian action or not and that more businesses engage in response activities, as opposed to recovery or preparedness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Didn’t know how to contribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the whole the businesses community recognised they did not know how or what to contribute to humanitarian action to create the greatest impact. As a result, there was also a risk of unsolicited and unneeded aid going into the Pacific, whereby what was provided was not requested or what was needed on the ground. This was significant given one NGO’s reflection that their preference is to used goods and services on the ground in the affected area to support local economic development, rather than importing goods and services from unaffected regions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting the right information: work in clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having the right information was recognised as critical. It was recognised information provided to the private sector needs to be specific, relevant, and engaging to each audience. Within the private sector there are natural clusters, for example, transport and logistics, communications, engineering who would have similar interests in humanitarian action and have specific and varied communication needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilise business skills and expertise through matching needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to tailor public private sector partnerships by identifying specific humanitarian needs and matching needs with business skills and resources. For example, one respondent articulated that multi-national businesses have disaster response plans, however, these haven’t been shared with the humanitarian sector (be that regional governments or NGOs). Business leaders would be open to discussing whether and how to transform ad hoc collaborations into long-term partnerships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One participant recognised that creating a culture of partnership between public and private sector actors before a disaster strikes and greater inclusion of the private sector in preparedness planning is essential if their support is to be leveraged effectively. This demands being respectful of each other’s assets and expertise. Another recognised the significance of learning to speak in a common vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solution Development and Next Steps

The Business Case

There is a clear business rationale for private sector to work with government and humanitarian organisations in humanitarian action. An activity on what business want and what they get from engaging in humanitarian action revealed that companies are moving away from a corporate social responsibility approach to a shared value approach in which engagement is based on core business concerns including: branding benefits; to innovate or refine product or service offering; staff recruitment, engagement and retention; to enable the quick recovery of effected markets; and improved government relations.

It was recognised that participating in humanitarian action could provide these benefits to businesses. It needs to be noted, however, that as many of the participants were engaging in advanced activities (beyond writing out a cheque) and thus the level of investment for the business would be considerable, these businesses may be more inclined to look for return on investment opportunities.

Potential Solutions and Contributions

Through the course of the workshop, participants created tactical solutions to some of the issues affecting humanitarian work and private sectors involvement. Areas of innovation that stood out as having the most opportunity included:

- An official communication platform between the private sector, government, humanitarian organisations and the public (including donators) with the goal to systemise dialogue and facilitate the process of matching core competencies and services with products with needs. A commitment to communicate, coordinate, collaborate before disasters. Adopting a framework that supports the identification of key priorities for preparedness, recovery, response that will help orient and expand private sector support.
- Sharing practice between the Pacific Island governments and institutions, NGOs and private sector. This could include ensuring we leverage learning from humanitarian successes and failings, learning from the private sector, learning from government, and learning from NGO.
- The private sector could also develop services to actively share best practice to build capability. This could, for example, occur for ports and airports whereby businesses could investigate review and rate and provide investment support for Pacific Island ports and airports infrastructure.
Next Steps

It was recognised that this was the first time the private sector had come together to have this conversation, and thus the workshop provided a great starting points for further collaboration.

The group indicated interest in launching a formal engagement process/forum for the private sector and the humanitarian community to enable regular dialogue and exchange of information. This would enable businesses to engage in policy discussions and identify opportunities for engagement before the onset of an emergency.