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Abstract

Owing largely to the multiplicity of actors resulting mainly from unprecedented exponential growth of humanitarian activity in the recent past, IDCs are among the emergent players on aidscape. Though the humanitarian flagship reports, clubbing funding to traditional actors and IDCs under the same category of ‘humanitarian assistance’, can be misleading on their exact share, yet the analysis on financial data of individual donors indicated that a good chunk is channeled through IDCs. The upwards trends concerning the role of IDCs can largely be attributed to the contracting out policies of major donors, revolving door policy among IDCs and major donors, their possibility to socialize with donors as well as evidence supporting that the IDCs have even funded political campaigns in some donor countries. Drawing on the fact that these IDCs are profit driven and may even work towards the achievement of certain political goals of donor countries, their ability to generate resources is termed as a trade-off between ‘generating additional resources’ and ‘respecting humanitarian principles’. This certainly has negative consequences for traditional humanitarian actors as the growing influence of IDCs is causing issues of competition for resources, coordination at operational level and posing challenges to traditional actors in maintaining their humanitarian capacity.
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1 Introduction and methodology

1.1 Background and problem statement

International Development Contractors (IDCs) along with traditional humanitarian actors including: UN agencies, international Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, governments and national and international NGOs/CBOs are among the emerging players in humanitarian action. Though the engagement of these IDCs in development sector is not new (Roberts 2014), their role in humanitarian sphere is relatively new and under-discussed area (Nagaraj 2015a). The protracted nature of crisis and the resultant increase in humanitarian activity in the recent past, contributed to the multiplicity of actors within the sector. This allowed for proliferation of actors including private sector in general and IDCs in particular (Stoddard et al. 2015). Organizations like International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) while confirming the rise, noted that during the post-cold war era the humanitarian activity observed an unprecedented exponential growth (ICRC 2011). Likewise, the findings of Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG) confirmed that humanitarian aid flow doubled from $2.1 billion to $5.9 billion during the period 1990 to 2000 (HPG 2002). This trend continued with ups and downs in the mid-2000s while the year 2010 once again witnessed high increase in funding mainly due to floods in Pakistan and earthquake in Haiti (Global Humanitarian Assistance 2015). Similarly, the Political Economists Gilles Carbonnier also confirmed the booming of humanitarian market post-cold war era; both in terms of funding and multiplicity of actors (Carbonnier 2015a). The booming of the humanitarian market over the past couple of decades where highlighted the humanitarian agenda, posed some challenges to the traditional actors as well as the sector itself. The major of which are presented as followed:

How the evolving nature of the humanitarian sector itself and the multiplicity of actors with various motivations added to the problematic? The multiplicity of actors, particularly the emergence of private sector and notably IDCs, has direct implications for principled humanitarianism. Researchers have characterized the involvement of IDCs as a trade-off between the ‘possibility to mobilize resources/skills’ and ‘respecting the core humanitarian principles’ (Julia & S.Hamilton 2010). The non-respect of humanitarian principles by the IDCs can have certain negative implications for traditional humanitarian actors. This situation is further accentuated by the fact that bifurcation between the IDCs and traditional actors is becoming increasingly blurred operationally. Gilles

---

1 Firms traditionally only in the business of development which are now diversifying into other areas and whose core or only business is not development
Carbonnier also confirmed that the current century is marked with two fundamental questioning; responsibilities of public institutions vis-à-vis private sector and the blurring of lines between for-profit and non-for profit organizations (Carbonnier 2006).

Reflecting on blurred lines, Nagaraj shared that compared to IDCs this situation is more problematic for traditional humanitarian actors. The companies usually already engaged in development activities in those countries could potentially exploit this situation in their favor (Nagaraj 2015b).

Another question arises that how the lack of reporting and particularly reporting on financial data of humanitarian operations by IDCs is adding to the confusion globally? A quick look of the global flagship humanitarian reporting mechanisms; including Global Humanitarian Assistance (GHA) report (Global Humanitarian Assistance 2015), The State of Humanitarian System Report by ALNAP (Taylor et al. 2012) and World Disaster Report 2015 (IFRC 2015a) expounds that IDCs are not evidently mentioned as recipient of humanitarian assistance. These reports rather clubbed the assistance both to IDCs and traditional actors under the uniform category of ‘humanitarian assistance’. This clustering of resources under the same category can largely be attributed to under reporting or for that matter no reporting by the IDCs under OECD/DAC or OCHA’s Financial Tracking System (FTS). Whatsoever the reason, the clustering of financial resources can be misleading as it reflects that traditional actors are the main or even sole recipient of humanitarian funding. This certainly puts all the blame on traditional actors, in case something goes wrong.

Likewise, contracting out mechanisms among major donors such as USAID and DFID is gaining popularity and this is worth researching that how does this impact funding for traditional actors? Empirical data shows that compared to traditional actors, the contracting out policy favor funding to IDCs (Roberts 2014), (Piccio 2014). Besides contracting out policy, the possibility of IDCs to influence decision making processes within donor countries and agencies, is another challenging area for traditional humanitarian actors (Roberts 2014). The shortage of funding certainly has negative implications for the traditional actors in terms of retaining their capacity and may have certain negative implications on principled humanitarianism at large.

In line with the above point, it is worth researching to understand that what coordination mechanisms among traditional actors and IDCs are existent at field level to avoid overlap? Evidence corroborates that IDCs are increasingly operational in crisis countries (Steets et al. 2012a) while still

---

2 Coordination is the systematic utilization of policy instruments to deliver humanitarian assistance in a cohesive and effective manner. Sensibly and sensitively employed, such instruments inject an element of discipline without unduly constraining action.
not part of formal coordination mechanisms. The lack of coordination between the main actors increases the chances of resource duplication at operational level.

Another fundamental question from IDCs phenomenon arises that how IDCs being profit driven can fully adhere to core humanitarian principles and what are the implications for traditional actors if these IDCs don’t do so? Evidence shows that the lack of adherence to core humanitarian principles by the IDCs is another problematic area which in the longer run has comparatively higher negative implications for principled humanitarian actors (Steets et al. 2012b).

In order to endeavor addressing the aforementioned problematic, this research posits the hypothesis that “the emerging humanitarian role of IDCs reduce funding for traditional humanitarian actors and promote funding for profit driven aid actors, thus create negative consequences for traditional humanitarian actors and “principled humanitarianism” at large. The research further endeavors to test the aforementioned hypothesis through the following main as well as sub-research questions:

“How does the increasing role of IDCs in humanitarian action challenges the role of traditional actors?” and;

- Who are IDCs and what is their positioning within humanitarian system?
- Who are main funding agencies for IDCs globally?
- What mechanisms are at play, enabling IDCs to acquire humanitarian and developmental funding?
- How the activities and importantly financial data of IDCs are reflected in global flagship reports?
- What coordination mechanism between the two actors are in-place to avoid duplication?
- How traditional actors perceive the impact of IDCs on principled humanitarianism?

Locating the main problematic under the purview of aforementioned main and sub-questions, the next section discusses methodology and possible limitations of the research. Important to note however that the purpose of this research is neither to discuss Private Military Companies (PMCs) nor suppliers, i.e. private companies who are providing services (IT, logistics, consulting services etc.) to humanitarian and development organizations. The scope of this research study is rather limited to IDCs such as Coffey Int. and Chemonics etc. who specialize in the delivery of developmental/humanitarian projects in developing countries.

---

3 Originally founded in 1959, the Australian based Coffey International ventured its overseas operations in 1970s. Currently, the company provides diverse portfolio of services in geotechnical, environmental, testing, project management and international development across the globe

4 Chemonics International, founded in 1970 is a US based company. The mission statement of the company reads that it promotes meaningful change around the world, helping people live healthier, more productive, and more independent.
1.2 Research approach and Methodology

Drawing largely on qualitative research approach, this research focused on reviewing relevant literature as well as document analysis to understand the global IDCs’ landscape, their positioning in humanitarian system in general and aid-scape in particular. The review and analysis specifically focused to understand who the major IDCs are, what is their role and share of humanitarian action and how their activities are reflected within the existing reporting mechanisms? Alongside literature review, the research studied a humanitarian context to situate the position of IDCs vis-a-vis traditional actors from an operational perspective. Pakistan, unfortunately offering a context where multiple disasters had hit the country over the last couple of decades, was selected for the case study (BBC 2015). Merit noting that within the selected case of Pakistan, the research, using semi structured interviews method, aimed at analyzing the perceptions of different key stakeholders such as I/NGOs as well as IDCs. The analysis were done mainly around existing funding base of IDCs, who are major IDC players, what coordination mechanisms were in-place as well as knowing perceptions around future funding trends among major donors. The blend of literature review augmented by document analysis and the case study approach provided a good mix of global critical overview as well as an in-depth understanding of the IDCs phenomenon in a specific humanitarian context (See Annex 1: Research approach).

The research adopted a two thronged methodology for generating and analyzing the data. The desk base literature review and document analysis helped in generating global data whereas the data from case study helped in analysis. The global data, considering IDCs as the primary research target group, was collected mainly around the following subject matters:

- Who are the major IDCs?
- What mechanisms are at play behind their funding?
- What chunk of humanitarian assistance is channeled through IDCs?
- How does IDCs’ involvement in HA influence funding for traditional actors?
- What is the role of IDCs in delivering humanitarian assistance?
- How funding trends among major donors positively or negatively influence funding to IDCs for humanitarian interventions?

In doing so, this research painstakingly reviewed number of methodical literature such as published books and articles as well as grey literature including articles, evaluation reports, research papers and data on webpages of different organizations including IDCs. The documents thus reviewed not only generated required data but also helped in the analysis as well. Likewise, the case study specifically focused the context of Pakistan post 2005 earthquake time.
As mentioned earlier, semi structured interviews were used as a primary method for data collection at the selected case level. A total of eleven interviews; four with IDCs and INGOs each and three with national NGOs, were conducted. The interviews were administered during the months of December 2015 and partly during January 2106. Except two national NGOs, one each in Swat of Malakand Division and one in Peshawar city, the rest of interviews were conducted in the capital city of Islamabad in Pakistan. The selection of respondent organizations was mainly done on the basis of a quasi-selection criteria including 1) registered body currently operational in country, 2) responding to or have responded to at least one of the major disasters post-earthquake 2005 and 3) are willing to provide required data even if unanimously. Prior initiating the interviews, separate questionnaire, one each for IDCs, INGOs and NGOs were developed (Annex 2 for interview plan). Since field testing primarily due to shortage of time was not an option, hence the questionnaires were vetted through different humanitarian practitioners, including Prof. Gilles Carbonnier who supervised this research, which helped in refining the conceptual contours of the questionnaires. Efforts were made that the questionnaires though comprehensive are not overly long to bore the respondents. Similarly, extra efforts were injected in making them understandable even in case respondents may like to fill on their own and share electronically (See annex 3A, 3B and 3C for questionnaires).

Staring with the personal contact in an INGO, mostly a snow ball effect, fulfilling the basic laid down selection criteria, was adopted to identify the respondent organizations. Prior interviews, individual emails explaining the purpose and estimated time of the interview were sent to the identified persons. The emails specifically mentioned about the assurance of confidentiality in case the respondents may not feel comfortable with disclosing their identity. In total fourteen organizations were approached, of which two IDCs and a national NGO excused themselves from taking part in the interview process. Likewise, of the total eleven interviewed respondents, except four; two each from INGOs and IDCs who preferred to fill the questionnaires and revert electronically, the rest of respondents were interviewed in person.

The data thus generated from filled questionnaires was analyzed under five main different sections. These included; profiling of the respondent organizations, perception around humanitarian funding and IDCs operations, coordination mechanisms and perception around future funding trends. The analysis under each section from the context of Pakistan, were compared to key findings of the literature review. The analysis and parallelism with literature review is exhaustively presented under
a separate chapter titled “Pakistan Case Study: Results and Discussions”. Drawing on the results and discussion section, this research concluded some findings and conclusions. On the basis of which the research humbly put forwarded few of the key recommendations. Following this, a comprehensive list of all the cited work and required annexures was provided.

1.3 Ethical considerations and limitations of the research
The research endeavored to review only publicly available credible literature and further concerted efforts were made to reference all the cited work judiciously. Nevertheless, as Mays and Pope noted, qualitative researches particularly ethnographic method which necessitates involving local population and contexts, are criticized for possible biases (Mays & Pope 1995). Drawing on this awareness, this research strived to select literature from variety of sources with diverse research methodologies to avoid or at least minimize the bias. Moreover, inspired from validity definition of Diniz, this research went extra miles to ensure that the data is credible and can be defended if challenged (Diniz 2008). On top of this, my personal, years’ long experience of the humanitarian sector has, certainly a validating effect on picking literature and interview respondents for this research. This too, may not be without subjectivity as I exclusively worked with traditional humanitarian actors without any direct experience of working with IDCs. However, extra efforts were made to select senior representatives from respondent organizations to avoid any possibility of personal biases towards a particular entity. Similarly, the primary data collection through interviews too can raise certain ethical issues particularly issue of confidentiality if the respondents are uncomfortable with disclosing their identities. This research has greater respect for any such confidentiality and therefore did not mention names of those respondents who were not willing to be identified.

Alongside ethical issues, this research is not without limitations. Time limitation was one such major factor. Coupled with lack of resources, the time limitation did not allow for interviewing a large representative sample from the selected case of Pakistan. However, this will have little implications on generalization of the findings as at least major players among traditional actors as well as IDCs were interviewed. Besides, scarcity of credible literature concerning the topic or for that matter their non-availability online, had been another limiting factor. Likewise, mainly due to the shortage of time and lack of availability of data, this research could not thoroughly focus on operational effectiveness of either actor. Therefore, cannot systematically conclude that which actor among the
traditional and IDCs are more effective or vice versa. Nevertheless, the limitations of this research open up new vistas of exploration, emphasizing on the need for further research on the topic.

2 Literature review

2.1 Global humanitarian system and IDCs

‘Humanitarian System’ in itself is an unclear and contested area (Aardema & Muguruza 2014). Variety of definitions and the fact that the concept of ‘humanitarian system’ is interchangeably used with terms such as ‘humanitarian architecture’, ‘humanitarian enterprise (Julia & S.Hamilton 2010)’, ‘humanitarian sector’(Davey et al. 2013) etc., atleast does not help clarify if not adding to the confusion. Among various definitions, a more encompassing one by (Walker & Maxwell 2009a) is selected for the purpose of this dissertation. According to them, the international humanitarian system is not designed rather it evolved. Therefore, like most products of evolution, it may have certain anomalies and contextual variation. They further submit that its people to people structure allows affected people to articulate their needs while allowing better off people in the human family to address those needs. The humanitarian agencies have the role to bridge between the affected and those who can play a role to mitigate their sufferings. Likewise, Walker and Maxwell classify the humanitarian agencies in four main categories; 1) subset of an individual country’s aid structure, 2) multi-lateral organizations, 3) the red cross and red crescent movements and 4) CBOs/NGOs (Walker & Maxwell 2009b)

Traditionally, UN agencies, ICRC, I/NGOs and host as well as donor governments are considered as the primary humanitarian actors. The complexity of the crisis has however added to the multiplicity of the actors. Hence emergence of new actors including but not limited to private sector in general and IDCs in particular is a reality. Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP)5 while referring to the role of private sector mentions that though humanitarian action is not their primary business but still they may work side by side with traditional humanitarian actors during crisis situation. The report further mentions that the private sector usually has different approach and objectives whereas their participation is also largely determined by geographic location of the crisis (Stoddard et al. 2015).

ALNAP though recognizing the private sector in general, does not unpack ‘private sector’ and its role, let alone clarity on the role of IDCs in humanitarian action. Contrary to this generic mention of

5 ALNAP founded in 1997, following the Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda (JEEAR), is a unique system-wide network dedicated to improving humanitarian performance through increased learning and accountability
the private sector, GPPi in one of its researches has elucidated on the engagement of private sector. The research suggested that the strong involvement of new players including private sector, involves a trade-off between attracting resources for the sector and respect for the core humanitarian principles of ‘neutrality’ and ‘independence’ (Steets et al. 2009) The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) (ICAI 2015) while conducting evaluation of DFID’s funding to contractors sees an increasing role for contractors. The evaluation further opine that these contractors are implementing quality programmes in a cost effective way (Independent Commission for Aid Impact 2013). Some of the NGOs have however badly criticized the study’s findings for its lack of effective comparison of the effectiveness of a private sector-led approach to poverty alleviation over a public sector-led one (Tran 2013). Similarly, another research by GPPi also suggested an increase private sector’s role with special reference to post Tsunami 2004 and Iraq war. The research findings suggested that compared to natural disasters, engagement of companies was observantly on rise in responding to complex emergencies. The research further suggested that upward trend of engaging private sector is not only practiced among US and UK donors, rather some European donors also engage the private sector in different ways. Something the traditional humanitarian actors criticized largely on grounds of non-adherence to humanitarian principles (Stoddard 2009).

The magnitude of IDCs’ engagement can be gauged from the fact that after Afghanistan and Haiti, Chemonics – one of the leading IDC, was the third biggest recipient of USAID funding during the year 2011 (Nagaraj 2015c). Worth noting however, that owing to the limitations of existing reporting mechanisms, ascertaining complete picture of engagement and volume of funding to IDCs is fairly complicated. Nagaraj (Nagaraj 2015d) as well as the earlier quoted research by GPPi (Stoddard 2009), have specifically referred to the difficulty in extracting data related to funding of contractors within the FTS of UNOCHA (FTS 2016).

Drawing on the fact that different terms and variety of concepts are used for actors other than traditional humanitarian actors, there is a need to explain that how this research defines the IDCs. Different terms and concepts, ranging from very broad terms of ‘private sector’ (Stoddard 2009) or ‘corporate sector’ (Adams & Martens 2015) ‘to a narrower connotation such as ‘contractors’ (ICAI 2013), ‘private for-profit companies’, ‘commercial actors’ (Brodie et al. 2009)(Nina 2008), ‘commercial entities (Stoddard 2009) etc. are used for business engagement in humanitarian sector. This research uses “International Development Contractors (IDCs)”, for the involvement of ‘private sector’ in humanitarian action. Primarily, the term is not only inclusive but reflective of what these
companies are doing on ground. Nagaraj while differentiating IDCs from International Business Companies, define the earlier as:

“International Development Contractors’ (IDCs) is preferred over ‘International Development Companies’ because it includes (a) firms whose core or only business is not development and (b) firms traditionally only in the business of development which are now diversifying into other areas. It is therefore more inclusive and accurate” (Nagaraj 2015b)

2.2 Principled humanitarian action and IDCs

The ‘humanitarian action’ too is a variedly defined concept. Referring to the difficulty, Johannes Paulmann rather finds ‘humanitarian action’ as a multifaceted assemblage of different concepts and terms (Paulmann 2013). The difficulty lies mainly in its constant evolution, changing nature and the divergent ways scholars and practitioners have defined it (Aardema & Muguruza 2014). Since the purpose of this research is not an exhaustive compilation of different definitions, an inclusive definition is selected for its consumption. Merit noting that this research interchangeably uses ‘humanitarianism, ‘humanitarian aid’, ‘humanitarian assistance’, and ‘humanitarian action’, hence the selected definition shall suffice the purpose of all the interchangeably used terms.

“Humanitarian assistance is generally accepted to mean the aid and action designed to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain and protect human dignity during and in the aftermath of man-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for the occurrence of such situation” (Development Initiatives 2016).

Drawing on the aforementioned definition, the principled humanitarianism in this research is referred to the delivery of humanitarian assistance following the core humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence (Development Initiatives 2016). Abiding by the principles is seemingly simple but the complexity of the crisis and multiplicity of actors, alongside other impeding factors, makes it complicated if not impossible. This is further complicated in conflict situations where space for delivery of need based assistance is shrinking (Macleod et al. 2016). Empirical data however shows that the businesses of contractors have flourished significantly in conflicts situations such as Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia. The document on ECHO program evaluation also noted that the portfolios of private contractors, notably in war-torn countries, have expanded from simply services provision to a range of other humanitarian activities. The study
further recorded that UN agencies\(^6\) in such countries normally used private contractors as an interface instead of employing its own staff. The reliance on private contractors largely stem from the fact to circumvent security and human resources rules of the agency. The document further noted that in certain cases one private company was implementing multiple UN funded projects. Ironically, some of the private contractors sub-contracted projects to purely non-humanitarian actors including commercial firms involved in security sector reform programs or even combat operations. Likewise, the document noted that the international organizations having political or military interests usually outsourced their projects to a private company identical with traditional humanitarian actors. The delivery of humanitarian assistance by any such actors not only compromises principled humanitarianism but may create access issues especially if parties to conflict may perceive them as part of the conflict (Steets et al. 2012). Nagaraj while referring to the website of Council of International Development Companies (CIDC)\(^7\) mentioned that the IDCs clearly stated on its site that they are working towards the achievement of objectives in support of US national goals internationally (Nagaraj 2015e). Any such statement denotes a strong political complicity with a particular identity while the principled humanitarianism strongly suggests for operational independence.

2.2.1 Major IDC players globally

Several IDCs originated in different countries are operational in different contexts across the globe. This and the subsequent sub-sections of the research largely discuss IDCs partnering with USAID and DFID. This is for two reasons; firstly these are among the top donors for development as well as humanitarian action internationally. Second and foremost importantly, USA and UK are home to majority of the big contractors. The historical and longstanding contracting practices within these countries are another important consideration for their selection.

Reflecting on the diagram (fig. 1), it is clear that Mott MacDonald, Adam Smith International, PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), Abt Associates, GRM International (renamed as Palladium)(Palladium 2016) were the top five contractors for DFID in 2012. The size of some of the big companies such as PwC can be gauged from the fact that the company with a total strength of 208,000 employees had offices in 157 countries during the year 2015 (PwC 2015). This figure is

\(^6\) The document does not clearly mention that these are UN Blue or Black but since its ECHO evaluation, I personally assume that the UN agencies referred to in the document are UN blue and not black

\(^7\) CIDC is US based network of development companies with an objective to create advocacy platform for US based development companies to pursue donors for dialogue and educate audience on the role these companies are playing.
equivalent to 30% of the overall humanitarian staffing in the year 2012, including the 427,000 staff of national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (RCRC) across the globe. The percentage without national staff of RCRC stands at incomparable 76 percent (Stoddard et al. 2015).

**Figure 1: DFID’s top contractor for the year 2012**

![DFID’s Top 20 Contract Awardees: Where They are Based](image)

Similarly analysis on the USAID official data shows that Chemonics international, John Snow Inc. Development Alternatives Inc., Creative Associates and Management System International (MSI) were the top five partner IDCs for USAID during the last couple of years (USSpendingGOV 2016). Important to note that some of the IDCs such as Chemonics and Crown Agents consider ‘development’ to be their main business while for majority others, development is just one of the many business areas (Nagaraj 2015e).

### 2.2.2 Funding overview and IDCs’ share

With the increasing plights of people affected from conflicts and natural disasters during the post-cold war era, an unprecedented expansion is seen in the humanitarian activity and funding (ICRC 2011). The HPG paper also confirmed the growth of the sector in the last decade of 20th century (HPG 2002). Similarly, the first decade of current century also observed upwards trend with some
ups and downs (GHA 2015). The below graphical presentation (Fig.2) based on OECD/DAC data illustrates a remarkable growing trend from merely a billion dollar official assistance in 1975 to a considerable amount of more than 15 billion in 2010.

**Figure 2: Official humanitarian assistance over the period 1975 to 2010**
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(GHA sources referring to OCED data, further confirmed that during the first decade of this century the governments across the globe had dolled-out a minimum of 97.8 billion US dollars for humanitarian assistance. The years from 2006 through 2010 and particularly the year 2010 saw the highest level of humanitarian funding ever. During these five years alone, the governments and private sector cumulatively could contribute a huge sum of US$73.9 billion, of which US$ 18 billion (24%) came from private sector. Compared to conflicts, the private sector, notably, individual contribution was on rise during natural disasters. The fact that the private donors could contribute a huge some of US$5.8 billion in 2010 alone, confirm this notion as the contribution during 2010 is mainly attributable to natural disasters in Haiti and Pakistan (GHA n.d.b).
Likewise, analysis on the data for humanitarian assistance shows that multilateral organizations, ICRC and NGOs are the primary channels for delivery of humanitarian assistance. Regardless of the rise in humanitarian assistance, little assistance is channeled through public sector. Nevertheless, the bifurcation of humanitarian assistance channeled through the ‘private sector’ in general and ‘IDCs’ in particular is a daunting task mainly due to lack of availability of segregated data.

**Figure 3: First-level recipients of international humanitarian assistance, 2008–2012**
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Source: Development Initiatives based on OECD DAC and UN OCHA FTS data (UNOCHA 2014)

The above visual illustration (Fig. 3) confirming traditional actors as the major recipient of humanitarian aid holds partially true as traditionally these organizations were considered to be the main actors. However, new actors not limited to but including private sector particularly IDCs, is an emerging trend in humanitarian action. But as presented earlier, still the lack of segregation of data on how much is channeled through these new actors is somehow an overlooked area.

Analysis on the funding channels of donors such as USAID, DFID and DFAT however suggested that alongside traditional actors, a good chunk of resources is channeled through IDCs. USAID’s data on humanitarian funding shows that compared to less than $3 billion worth contracts in 2003, this industry handled over $12 billion in 2014; majority funds channeled through contracts instead of grants (Roberts 2014).
The data presented in the chart (Fig.4) shows that USAID had contributed official ODA amounting to a total of US$ 85.83 billion during the years 2010 through 2015. Of this figures, US$ 28.27 billion or 33 percent went alone to contractors while the remaining were dolled-out to traditional actors including UN agencies, ICRC, I/NGOs etc. Important to note here that other than the contracts, around 30% or above funding under the ‘grants’ were also channeled through contractors (USSpendingGOV 2016).

The figures for DFID are not favoring the traditional humanitarian actors over contractors either. During the year 2010-2011, DFID disbursed a total of 436.1 million pounds to contractors (Villarino 2011). Similarly, the Department awarded a total of 135 contracts worth £489 million during the year 2011-12. Of this number, 58 contracts were awarded to IDCs (Independent Commission for Aid Impact 2013). During the same year DFID, being the fifth biggest donor to Nigeria, channeled 75 percent of its funding in the country through private contractors. Cumulatively, DFID globally during the same year had channeled nine percent of its ODA through private commercial companies (Lorenz Piccio 2015). Analysis on data further showed that of the top 20 contractors, over 75 percent of the funding went to 14 UK based contractors (see figure 1).

Data of the Australian Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) also draws comparable picture of channelization of considerable resources through contractors. The data for the year 2014 showed that the Department had contributed a total official ODA amounting to Aus. $ 4.3 billion. Of this figure, the humanitarian funding amounted to Aus$ 657million wherein contractors could bag 10
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8 The paragraph is developed on basis of data from the website presented in the caption of the graph
percent share, turning this group the third major recipient after multilateral organizations (59.5%), NGOs (23%) followed by Australian public sector organizations (3%), other organizations (2.4%), host governments (1.7%) and academia (0.4%). Putting the overall ODA figure into perspective, one can easily understand that contractors are among the emerging players. Similarly, of the total Australian ODA contribution for the year 2014, the contractors received Aus$ 806.6 million or 19% whereas the NGOs could bag a total of Aus $ 562 or 13% (DFAT 2016). DARA\(^9\) while referring to OECD/DAC data, mentioned in its Humanitarian Response Index (HRI) report that alongside other donor countries; Germany, Netherlands and Denmark paid 15%, 7% and 1.8% respectively of overall assistance to private companies and foundations during the year 2010. Worth noting, that Germany, Netherlands and Denmark had contributed 4.5%, 6.8% and 6.2% of their total ODA respectively under humanitarian assistance (Dara 2012).

Contrary to GHA’s data on ‘humanitarian assistance’ which suggests that traditional actors are the main recipients, the analysis on data of the major donors presented above highlights that considerable chunk of ODA and even humanitarian assistance therein is channeled through contractors. However, the fact still remains that this analysis is not without limitation as the sources of data except DFAT, do not provide sufficient evidence on segregation of funding to contractors for development and humanitarian purposes. Though indicative, still the analysis paints a picture of considerable share of IDCs in the overall aid paradigm.

### 2.2.3 IDCs and the changing funding trends

Reflecting on the funding flow for development and humanitarian assistance shows that major donors such as DFID and USAID have increasingly adopted contracting out as a preferred way for funds disbursement. Evidence substantiated that the US based contracting industry mainly coevolved with the rise of contracting culture within USAID. The Agency has number of procurement procedures including Requests for Proposals (RFP), Request for Quotations (RFQs) and Indefinite Quantity Contracts (IQC) to invite potential contractors and traditional actors for bidding. The later usually compete for grants as the nature of contracts is different and the process particularly for IQCs is very complex and takes more than a year. With the personnel cuts within USAID, the agency largely relied on issuing IQCs, inviting bids for multi-year and multi million contracts. This
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\(^9\)Founded in 2003 a Spanish origin, DARA is an independent organisation committed to improving the quality and effectiveness of aid for vulnerable populations suffering from conflict, disasters and climate change.
type of contracts transferred the administrative burden on the applicant agency and by default tends to favor large contractors as they are better placed to compete for such contracts (Roberts 2014).

Likewise, analysis on DFID’s funding for the year 2011-2012 presents that the Department had channeled 880 million pound or 11.82 percent of its total funding through non-for-profit organizations compared to 9 percent spending through contractors. Nevertheless, the Devex sources noted that the Department’s funding through contracting is on rise (Piccio 2014). Similarly, a deep dive into the funding of individual top three non-for-profit and top three contractors presents that contractors had bagged comparatively larger sum than their non-for-profit counterparts. Among the top three non-for-profit organizations, BRAC received 51.3 million pound whereas Oxfam and Population Council International received 34.8 and 31.8 million pounds respectively (Parman and 2013). Compared to this group, the top three contractors namely Mott McDonald, Crown Agents and GRM could bag 54, 43.2 and 30.6 million pound respectively (Villarino 2011). This employs that contractors were the one winning large contracts.

Besides contracting arrangements, background check on selected IDCs unearthed strong link between key personnel of contractors with that of funding agencies as well as political parties in certain donor countries (DEC 1999). Data shows that the revolving door arrangement through which personnel flow between funding agencies and the IDCs has been an influencing factor in increasing funding base of some of the IDCs (Igoe 2016). Similarly, a US based investigative news organization has also referred to certain malpractices for winning contracts. According to the findings of this news organization, the IDCs have not only ties with political parties but post Iraq and Afghanistan wars, the major recipient companies and individuals had donated around $ 500,000 to the presidential campaign of George W. Bush (Beelman 2003). Similarly, the findings of the study revealed that personal links between personnel of the IDCs and agencies such as USAID have a payback effect on winning large contracts. The study has quoted one such example of Creative Associates where this Company was awarded a contract upto worth US$ 157 million in Iraq during the year 2003. It was the only Company invited to bid for this contract. The study further highlighted that the then representative of Creative Associates, who was invited to a roundtable discussion prior the launch of the bid, had served as Education Director for Middle East within the USAID. This explains that how this particular multi-million contract was awarded to this contractor. Similarly, the findings of the study referred to strong links between founder and principal owner of the Chemonics and USAID. Chemonics has been a major recipient of USAID funding; with 90 percent of its
funding coming from USAID post Iraq and Afghanistan wars. The company was founded by a former State Department’s Foreign Service officer, whereas Scott Spangler who owned 52 percent of the company’s stock was former employee of the USAID. Besides, Spangler and his wife, who was also among the board of directors of the company, had contributed a sum of US$ 98,460 to the cause of Republic Party since 1990 (The center for public Integrity 2003). DAI - US based company is another example of the many from this field. Jean Gilson, banker by profession holding a senior position within the Company had held key positions within USAID. She had joined DAI in 1990 as Senior Vice President of the Strategy and Marketing Group. During the period from 2000 to 2006 she worked with USAID on several key positions including Senior Policy Advisor and joined DAI back in 2006 as the second highest officer in the Company (Roberts 2014).

The above analysis establishes that contracting out policy of major donors, contractors’ support to political parties and existence of strong personal link between contractors and public departments/donors agencies have certainly an influencing effect on funding decisions within the sector. Resultantly the IDCs are successful in securing large sum of budgets for their operations.

2.4 Global humanitarian reporting and IDCs

The increasing humanitarian activity necessitated for availability of sufficient reliable data to improve efficiency as well as ensure transparency and accountability at different levels. Therefore, several global reporting mechanisms were launched for this purpose to capture the required data. World Disaster report by IFRC (IFRC 2015a), GHA by Development Initiative (Global Humanitarian Assistance 2015), SOHS by Humanitarian Outcomes (Stoddard et al. 2015) and HRI by DARA are worth mentioning. Following is a brief account of each flagship report with particular emphasis on ascertaining the role of private sector in general and IDCs in particular in the delivery of humanitarian assistance.

World Disaster Report is the first of its kind. The report first appeared in 1993 and since then it is published each year. With special focus on vulnerable affected people and local institutions as mainstay of prevention, preparedness and relief efforts mainly against natural disasters, the report tackles one main issue each year. The theme of the 2015 report was “local actors, the key to humanitarian effectiveness”. The report while using generic term of ‘private sector’ mainly refers to private service providers and not to the private companies involved in humanitarian action. Similarly, the report does not provide specific details on what role exactly the IDCs are playing in delivering humanitarian action. The report however, suggests for greater coordination among
traditional humanitarian actors and private sector for effective response to emergencies (IFRC 2015b)

**GHA Report** is an independent report by Development Initiative. The Report was first commissioned by Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) in 2000 and since then it is published annually. The Report primarily aims at improving efficiency, effectiveness and coherence of Humanitarian Action through access to reliable data. Similar to the World Disaster Report, this reporting tool also mentions the generic term of ‘private sector’ without further unpacking what role exactly does this sector plays. The Report beautifully grasps various types of humanitarian data, using attractive charts but still fails to provide segregated data on how much humanitarian assistance is channeled through ‘private sector’, let alone IDCs (Global Humanitarian Assistance 2015).

**SOHS Report** commissioned by ALNAP and authored by Humanitarian Outcomes is another such reporting tool. The Report was first launched in 2007 and is being published every three years with a primary objective of providing system level mapping and assessment of humanitarian assistance globally. The Report endeavors to paint a comprehensive picture of the current system with insights on the future trends (Stoddard et al. 2015). However, the analysis from the perspective of IDCs like the other two reporting mechanisms shows that this report too lacks significant clarifying details on the role of ‘private sector’ in general and ‘IDCs’ in particular. Similar to other reports, this report also uses the generic term of ‘private sector’ without substantial clarity on its role within the humanitarian sector. On contrary, the report down plays the role of ‘private sector’ while mentioning that it does not contribute to the burden sharing at scale (Stoddard et al. 2015). Any generalization might hold partially true but still in the presence of proper analysis on the role of private sector within humanitarian action, one might tend to avoid it.

**HRI** is another global instrument, launched back in 2007 by a non-for-profit organization called DARA. The last report of this series was published in 2011. The Index aims at assessing the quality, effectiveness, transparency and accountability of ‘aid’ from the perspective of donors’ adherence to Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) principles (Dara 2012). The last report published in 2011 while analyzing donors’ data for the year 2010 carries segregated data on percentage payment to private companies and foundation. Unlike other reporting tools, this report presents some analysis which shows that how much assistance certain countries had doled out to private sector. According to the report, countries such as Germany, Netherlands and Denmark had channeled a reasonable percentage of up to 15% of their humanitarian assistance through private companies (Dara 2012).
This and other sub-section of the global literature review suggests for a considerable role of IDCs but still ascertaining their exact role in the absence of segregated data is a difficult task.

3  **Pakistan Case Study: Results & Discussion**

3.1  **Introduction**

This chapter analyzes the context of Pakistan to situate the IDCs phenomenon from an operational perspective. As noted in the methodology section of this research, the selection of the context was mainly based on its past history of disasters and the resultant increase in humanitarian activity which beside traditional actors had attracted IDCs as well. Pakistan with a covered area of 307,0374 miles and an approximate population of around 180million is situated in the northwest part of South Asia (N/A 2015). The country shares border with India in the east, Afghanistan and Iran in the west, and with China in the northeast. Surrounded by land from three sides and the Arabian Sea in the south, the country is of greater geo-political importance. Administratively, the country consists of four provinces; Punjab, KP, Sindh and Baluchistan and the autonomous territories of Azad Kashmir, Gilgit Baltistan and FATA (Khan 2014). Unfortunately, Pakistan is among the top ten countries that are most vulnerable to disasters in Asia (APP 2015). The country’s timeline shows that since its creation, Pakistan has witnessed large scale manmade and natural disasters; including two wars (1965 and 1971) with the neighboring India over the disputed state of Kashmir (Memon 2012) (Mir Ahmad 2014). Besides, internal troubles and tensions in parts of the country have also been witnessed for some time now (Hoodhoy & Mian 2011). Likewise, the country has witnessed large scale natural disasters over the last couple of decades. Of these, the earthquake of 2005 and the floods in 2010, 2011 and 2014 were the most devastating one (PWP 2011).

The chapter presents data collected through semi-structured interviews with selected representatives from INGOs, NGOs and IDCs. The data thus generated and analyzed is presented under five different sub-sections including profiling, perceptions about funding, IDCs’ operations, coordination mechanisms and future funding trends. The data under individual sub-section is cross analyzed with the main findings of literature review.

3.2  **Profiling of respondent organizations:**

A total of eleven organizations; four International NGOs, four IDCs and three National NGOs were interviewed for the purpose of this research. Except national NGOs whose main offices were in KP the rest of the interviewed organizations were located in the capital city of Islamabad. Concerning mandate of the interviewed organizations, all of the interviewed INGOs and national NGOs
confirmed as dual mandate; both development and humanitarian. On contrary all interviewed IDCs mentioned “development” as their core business. Similarly, data collected from interviews suggested that compared to longstanding presence of INGOs and NGOs with the exception of Befare, the IDCs’ phenomenon is comparatively recent in the country (see Annexure 4: profiles of organizations). Analysis on the data presented in the annexure is of particular importance concerning the presence of the organizations, their mandate, operational areas and personnel working with these IDCs. The emergence of IDCs in Pakistan since the first decade of 21st century is in conformity of Nagaraj’s opinion (Nagaraj 2015d) that the IDCs’ role in humanitarian sphere is comparatively new. This statement however seems in contradiction to the data presented in the annexure as all of the four IDCs referred to ‘development’ instead of ‘humanitarian’ as their core business. However, this can be discussed as this is not a true representation of their mandate. First, the area of their geographic operations, particularly the province of KP, suffered multiple shocks of huge magnitude including Earthquake 2005 as well as insurgency in Malakand Division and floods 2010 and 2011 (Crises Response Bulletin 2015). The emergence of these IDCs coincides with the timelines of the mentioned major disasters in the province – a juncture of time when the developmental operations are normally halted. Secondly, almost all of the interviewed IDCs are receiving funds under humanitarian funding streams such as DFID’s Multi-year humanitarian funding which clearly reflects their humanitarian role (Development Initatives 2016).

Likewise, the analysis on personnel working with IDCs in the context of Pakistan is not different than that of revolving door arrangement at global level (Maud beelman 2003). Of the four interviewees from the IDCs, two interviewees were previously working with one of the major INGO. They had recently quit their jobs and started working with two different IDCs. This has conspicuous implications for INGOs in terms of retaining skilled staff for maintaining their humanitarian capacity. Furthermore, some of the interviewees, with the condition of confidentiality, shared that uncertainty around re-registration process of INGOs in Pakistan and higher salary packages of the IDCs are among the mains reasons for their joining IDCs. One of them, holding previously senior level position within an INGO further mentioned that he is getting almost double salary than he was drawing from INGO and that too for almost the same or even lesser workload. Similarly, a deep dive on profiles of some of the key personnel of IDCs revealed that they were either previously holding key roles within Donors such as USAID, government of Pakistan or even both. The present Team
Leaders for Technical Resource Facility (TRF) project of Mott McDonalds and DAI education project, both funded by DFID, are among such examples. The Team Leader for TRF previously held key positions with USAID and DFID (Mott Mac Donald 2012) whereas the Team Leader for DAI project has had previously held senior positions within governments and international organizations including principal advisor to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan until January 2013 (DAI 2015). The case study of Pakistan further highlighted another staggering practice of revolving door between some of the IDCs and sitting government officials. A leading national newspaper ‘daily the dawn’ reported back in 2014 that Coffey International had hired high ranking police officers as consultants for its DFID funded Police Sector Reforms project. The Contractor paid lucrative monthly packages to the consultants worth million Pakistani Rupees. This clearly reflects conflict of interest as well as indicates towards malpractices within the procurement process of such IDCs. The news article further highlighted that the hired consultants had offshore accounts to evade taxes on the lofty consultancy fee (Raza 2014). Besides, the data further highlighted that compared to IDCs national NGOs followed by INGOs were more open to sharing information.

3.3 Perception about funding environment:
Data collection on perceptions about funding environment in country was another important section of the semi-structured interviews. Of the total four respondent INGOs, only SC’s estimated annual budget for the year 2016 is between 21-30 million. IRC did not share its budget, IR World Wide mentioned between US$ 11-20 million whereas Action Aid mentioned its budget between 0-10 million annually. Similarly, data on main funding sources of INGOs presented variation across organizations. IRC is 100 percent dependent on institutional funding whereas SC, IR World Wide and Action Aid depends on variety of funding sources including institutional, individuals, members and corporate. Concerning funding situation over the last five years, two out of four INGOs mentioned decrease in funding for humanitarian and developmental activities in Pakistan. Similarly, all four INGOs consider IDCs as one of the major competitors for funding. Three out of four INGOs consider that IDCs have advantageous edge over INGOs. All of them consider ‘contracting out policy of some of the donors’, as top reason with ‘cost effectiveness’ and ‘high acceptability within government’ as other reasons for advantageous edge of IDCs over INGOs. Likewise, overwhelming majority of the interviewed INGOs consider constraining access, security issues and donor policies as major funding challenges for INGOs in Pakistan.
Compared to INGOs funding, the funding volume of interviewed IDCs is way higher. Of the four IDCs, DAI and ASI mentioned US$ 46 million & above, and 31-46 million respectively whereas Mott McDonalds and Coffey International mentioned US$ 11-20 million and 0-15 million respectively. Worth mentioning that the budgets of both Mott McDonalds and Coffey International were not representative of their overall organizations as both the interviewee had mentioned only budgets of their respective projects instead of the overall organizational budgets. The Mott McDonald provided information on the budget of its DFID funded TRF project (Mott Mac Donald 2012) while the Coffey International supplied info on its Rule of Law project funded again by DFID (Coffey 2016b). Similarly, all interviewed IDCs were fully dependent on institutional funding with USAID and DFID as pre-dominantly the major donors. Concerning funding situation in Pakistan over the last five years, overwhelming majority of three out of four IDCs believe that funding has increased while Mott McDonald sees the situation unchanged. Similarly, all the IDCs except Coffey International were of the opinion that IDCs have advantageous edge over INGOs mainly due to ‘cost effectiveness/efficiency’, ‘technical capacity’, and ‘technology’, followed by ‘contracting out policy of some of the donors’, ‘possibility of working in less safe areas’, and ‘high acceptability within government’. Moreover, compared to INGOs, majority of the IDCs don’t see access issue as a major challenge.

Two of the three interviewed national NGOs stood between the annual budgets of US$ 10-20 million whereas one has an estimated budget between 0-10million. The rest of attributes of the data are almost similar to that of INGOs. Though mainly dependent on institutional funding, these NGOs have diverse funding base. Similarly, all the three NGOs shared that funding has decreased. Furthermore, they perceived that IDCs have advantageous edge over INGOs/NGOs mainly due to ‘contracting out policy of some of the donors’. One interviewee from national NGOs however, mentioned ‘technical capacity’ and ‘possibility of working in non-safe areas’ as other advantageous edge of IDCs over INGOs. The interviewed NGOs considered the proliferation of IDCs and NoC issues as one of the major challenges. One respondent in the national NGOs on the condition of confidentiality also referred to unethical practices within some of the donor agencies including UN and INGOs as one of the major challenges for national NGOs in the country (See Annexure 5: perceptions of funding environment).

Analysis on the data related to funding environment in the context of Pakistan is largely in conformity with the findings of literature review. The data clearly showcased that IDCs are
emerging players on aid-scape and overwhelming majority of the interviewed INGOs and NGOs considered IDCs to be their main competitors for funding in Pakistan. A further close up look on the funding environment presented that the two major recipient IDCs including DAI and ASI, outnumbered all the interviewed INGOs and NGOs except IRC as the later did not provide financial information. As per analysis, on an average US$ 81 m were cumulatively available to the interviewed INGOs and NGOs annually whereas the two IDCs alone had an estimated annual budget of US$ 92 million. Similarly, the analysis further confirmed that USAID and DFID were by and large the main funding sources of IDCs in Pakistan. Their “contracting out policy” primarily provided harboring environment to such contractors. Reflecting on the contracting mechanism in Pakistan, the Country Director of Action Aid shared that major donors such as USAID and DFID, under their contracting out policy, tend to dole out mega contracts. This is again in full conformity with the literature review of this research (Roberts 2014). The Director also explained that for any such contracts, the donors require bank guarantees which usually traditional actors are unable to provide. This favors big IDCs as they are better placed to comply with such requirements. The country director further maintained that compared to INGOs, IDCs have better possibilities of socializing with donors in country – another possibility of influencing their funding decisions. While specifically referring to the challenges of rights based organizations such as Action Aid, the Country Director shared that the ill practices and submissiveness of IDCs towards donors, pose particular challenges for funding of right based organizations. These organizations often challenge donors’ decisions if the later don’t take into account local context while the IDCs will never do the same. Another respondent of an INGO shared his practical experience of IDCs obliging the government officials. He narrated that while developing a joint submission for a mega contract, the co-applicant IDC insisted on a lucrative budget for training. Upon inquiry, representative of the IDC clarified that any such budget aims at capacity strengthening of the relevant government officials including their foreign trips. The INGO respondent further shared that any such lavish spending on government officials can prove slippery slope. Habitual of which, the government officials may demand the same from NGOs/INGOs which usually is beyond their limited resources.

3.4 Perception about IDCs operations in Pakistan:
Except a local NGO which also mentioned Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), the rest of the respondent organizations are predominantly operational in parts of Punjab, KP, Sindh and Baluchistan provinces of the country. Alongside geography, the respondent organizations mentioned
overlap between INGOs/NGOs and IDCs in certain thematic areas. The overlap is mainly under Health, Education, DRR and FSL sectors. Concerning major IDC players in the context of Pakistan, the respondent organizations were unanimous on names of few IDCs such as DAI (DAI 2016), Coffey International (Coffey 2016), and Mott McDonalds (MAcDonald 2016). Similarly, Adam Smith International (Adam Smith International 2016), GRM/Palladium (Palladium 2016), Crown Agents (Crown Agents 2016), MSI (MSI 2016), Creative Associates (Creative associates 2016), IMC (iMC 2016), Chemonics (CHEMONICS 2016), JSI (JSI 2016), OPM (Oxford Policy Management 2016) and Jhpiego (Jhpiego 2016) were other names enlisted by respondents.

In response to a question about implementation modalities, all the respondent INGOs and NGOs were of the opinion that IDCs implement their projects either through implementing partners or both; self-implementation as well as through local partners. Except one respondent IDC who suggested for implementation through IPs, overwhelming majority of three out of four IDCs, however, opined on self-implementation by the IDCs. Majority of the respondent organizations; six out of eleven were of the impression that IDCs are equipped for participatory approaches. Four considered them not prepared while one of the respondent IDCs was not clear about it. Relevant to this question, one respondent was of the view that IDCs don’t take into account the “Do No Harm” approach while four were of the view that they take into account the DnH approach (CDA 2004) partially.

Community as well as INGOs/NGOs’ perception about the work of IDCs was another question. According to the data, four out of the eleven respondent organizations were of the view that community perceives the work of IDCs as ‘substitute to INGOs’. Similarly, four mentioned that communities are ‘not clear’ about the work of IDCs, one think as ‘for profit’ and one ‘did not know’ about the perception of the community about the work of the IDCs. Only one respondent was thinking that communities perceive their work as humanitarian/development. Contrary to community perception, four out of eleven respondents were of the opinion that INGOs/NGOs perceive that IDCs are working for ‘profit’, three each considered them to be ‘substitute of INGOs’, and ‘humanitarian/development’ while one respondent termed their role as ‘harmful’.

Moreover, a clear majority of eight respondents out of eleven; four from INGOs, three from IDCs and one from NGOs were of the opinion that IDCs have advantageous edge over INGOs operationally. The respondents considered ‘technical expertise’, and ‘skilled staff’ along with ‘sharing financial risk’ and ‘HR systems’ as main reasons for their advantageous edge. Likewise, an overwhelming majority; six out of seven respondent INGOs/NGOs considered that INGOs/NGOs
are facing operational problems due to IDCs. They considered ‘attracting skilled staff of INGOs/NGOs by IDCs’ as main challenge alongside ‘lack of accountability towards community’, ‘overlapping’, and ‘negative perception of community’ (See Annexure 6: perception about operations of IDCs).

Analysis of the data presented under this particular sub-section is of paramount importance particularly with regards to overlapping, perception of communities and the challenges INGOs/NGOs face due to the presence of IDCs. The operational overlapping clearly suggests an increasing competition for funding between IDCs and traditional humanitarian actors. Likewise, the thematic overlapping may potentially add to the confusion at community level concerning their respective roles as well. This confusion is clearly reflected when the respondent organizations were asked that how communities perceive the work of IDCs. Majority of them either considered them as substitute of INGOs or they were not clear about their role. Any such confusing perception can be comparatively more problematic for traditional humanitarian actors. The reason being that if something goes wrong operationally, the communities will not be able to identify IDCs rather they may put the blame on humanitarian actors. The lack of mention of the exact role of IDCs under the global flagship reports discussed under literature review part of this research augment this opinion. The lack or no mention of their role globally means no debate on the quality and cost effectiveness of their humanitarian programmes. Likewise, the increasing role of IDCs in humanitarian/development sphere poses challenges to traditional humanitarian actors for retaining their humanitarian capacity. The IDCs, paying lucrative packages, have been attracting skilled staff of INGs/NGOs which may have certain implications on capacity of traditional actors to respond to future emergencies.

3.5 Coordination mechanism and IDCs:
Coordination mechanisms between IDCs and the traditional humanitarian actors was another main section of the semi structured interviews. Accordingly, of the total eleven respondents, only two were of the opinion that IDCs, post disasters, used to participate in cluster system. Moreover, three out of eleven mentioned that the IDCs don’t report on OCHA coordinated 3Ws matrix (UNOCHA 2014) and FTS (FTS 2016), whereas eight respondents had no idea. Merit noting, all the interviewed IDCs mentioned that they were not reporting on FTS. In response to a continuation question, except one respondent, all had no idea that how funding to the IDCs for humanitarian and developmental activities are reflected in the global flagship reports. Nevertheless, an overwhelming majority of ten
out of eleven respondents shared that funding to IDCs should be reflected ‘separate than traditional humanitarian actors. In addition, when asked about IDCs’ adherence to core humanitarian principles, six out of 11 respondents were of the view that the IDCs don’t follow the principles while three; one each from INGOs, NGOs and IDCs were of the view that they do. Two more had no idea (See Annexure 7: Coordination).

Analysis on the aforementioned data highlights that though operating in the same geographic areas with identical interventions than traditional actors, the IDCs were not largely part of the coordination mechanism. This increases chances of operational overlap as presented in the previous sub-section of this research. Furthermore, as the literature review of this research while referring to Nagaraj (Nagaraj 2015e) and GPpi (Stoddard 2009) noted, analysis on the data of case study confirmed that the IDCs are usually not reporting on 3Ws matrix and FTS. The lack of reporting, particularly financial reporting, implicates availability of accurate financial data in terms of how much assistance is channeled through which actor. The dearth of any such important data can also raise questions of transparency and accountability within the overall humanitarian system. In addition, the analysis suggests that majority of the interviewed actors are of the opinion that IDCs don’t follow core humanitarian principles. This raises fundamental question on their very engagement in the humanitarian sector. In line with this assumption that IDCs are not humanitarian actors in true spirit, one of the respondents from INGOs mentioned that some of the IDCs had applied for the membership of Pakistan Humanitarian Forum (PHF) but they were refused membership. The primary reason supplied for refusal was that PHF is a forum of humanitarian actors (PHF 2003) while IDCs are not driven by humanitarian principles and values alone, hence cannot be registered under the forum.

3.6 Perception about future funding trends:
This sub-section captures perception of the respondents with regards to future trends among major donors. A clear majority of seven out of eleven respondents were of the opinion that ‘contracting out’ is becoming popular trend among major donors. Two respondents were of the thinking that both; ‘contracting out’ and ‘grants’, one considered ‘grants’ whereas one shared that grants + bilateral funding are future trends among major donors for doling out their humanitarian funding. Worth noting that two respondents from IDCs shared that the IDCs are equally eligible for grants and the representative from Mott McDonald specifically mentioned that the current DFID funded TRF project is also a grant. In response to a continuation question, four out of eleven respondents
exclusively referred to IDCs as better placed to secure funding under contracting out policy of donors. Four more put ‘IDCs’ at equal position with consortium, two considered INGOs/NGOs whereas only one respondent considered consortium to be better placed to secure funding under contracting out policy of donors. Likewise, five of the respondents opined that IDCs are better placed to act as ‘fund manager’ in case of applying for funding through consortium. This was followed by three respondents who thought that this depends on the nature of the Call, two considered INGOs/NGOs while one voted for UN being better placed to be fund manager of a consortium. In addition, the national NGOs when asked, opined that IDCs have more potential to be major recipient of future funding from donors such as USAID and DFID in country. Similarly, majority of the interviewees were of the opinion that IDCs and UN compared to INGOs, amid the current security situation around foreign funded programs, have better possibility of operating in country (See Annexure 8: Perceptions about funding environment).

An analytical view of the above presented data suggests that ‘contracting out’ is gaining popularity among major donors for doling out their funding. As noted earlier, this largely favors IDCs at the expense of traditional actors. Similarly, compared to traditional humanitarian actors, IDCs are better placed to be fund manager in case of applying for funding in consortia. Besides, the analysis also highlights that IDCs are equally competing for grants which confirm the cited literature, mentioning that the USAID had doled out 30% or above grants to IDCs (USSpendingGOV 2016). This certainly has implications for traditional humanitarian actors as shortage of funding would mean reduced or no capacity to operate. In addition to funding trends, the access issue in contexts such as Pakistan is comparatively graver for INGOs. Within the context of Pakistan, where the government has started tight scrutiny of the foreign funded organizations, the predominant perception is that it is affecting INGOs disproportionately. The government has asked all the INGOs to go through a re-registration process (ICNL 2016) whereas the interviews highlighted that this is not the case with IDCs. This needs further probing as this research could not validate this information from other sources. However, if this is true, this certainly impacts the operations of INGOs in country negatively.

4 Conclusion and recommendations:

4.1 Conclusion:

Literature review as well as the findings of case study confirmed that alongside traditional actors, IDCs are among the emergent players. Similarly, the analysis suggested that the scope of IDCs have observantly increased during post disaster times (Steets et al. 2012). Any such evidence substantiates
the arguments concerning their humanitarian role. However, owing to the non-availability of segregated data globally, ascertaining their exact role in humanitarian sphere is a daunting task. Likewise, the global flagship reports as well as the case of Pakistan highlighted that accurate data on funding to IDCs for humanitarian and developmental interventions are not systematically available (FTS 2016). Except HRI by DARA, almost all major global flagship reporting mechanisms referred to in this research, (see 2.4 global humanitarian reporting and IDCs) fail to bifurcate financial assistance channeled through IDCs. Instead, these reporting mechanisms club the overall assistance under the uniform category of ‘humanitarian assistance’. This clustering of resources under the same category makes it challenging to know the exact share of IDCs in global humanitarian aid. This certainly has implications on holding them accountable. Nevertheless, analysis on data of individual donors such as USAID and DFID (see 2.2.2 Funding overview and IDCs’ share) suggested that IDCs were among the major recipients of aid over the last couple of decades. The analysis on the context of Pakistan also confirms this finding. Accordingly, only two major IDCs have higher funding than the six interviewed INGOs and NGOs. Similarly, the context of Pakistan also endorses that IDCs are comparatively better placed to secure not only funding under contracts but have been successful in securing large grants such as DFID funded TRF project of Mott McDonalds. This research also concludes that ‘contracting out’ instead of ‘granting’ has been gaining popularity among major donors. This, alongside revolving door arrangements where personnel frequently flow between major IDCs and donors as well governments, have an influencing effect on funding decisions in favor of IDCs (Susan M.Roberts 2014). The analysis of Pakistani context also confirmed that contracting out policy of some of the major donors, possibility of IDCs to socialize with donors and flowing personnel between IDCs and donors as well as government departments have been putting IDCs at the advantageous edge in the context of Pakistan. This research finds out that geographical as well as thematic overlapping, identified in the context of Pakistan, is one of the problematic areas between IDCs and traditional humanitarian actors. IDCs, particularly under the thematic areas of Health, Education, DRR and FSL, are implementing almost similar nature of activities than traditional actors. This, on one hand increases competition between the two for funding while on the other potentially leads to duplication of resources. Likewise, the context of Pakistan further highlighted that though operational in the same geographic areas, IDCs are usually not part of UN OCHA cluster system. They also don’t report on UNOCHA coordinated 3Ws matrix and FTS, employed mainly during post disaster responses. This lack of
coordination widens the gap between IDCs and traditional actors operationally. Additionally, as discussed earlier, the lack of proper reporting by IDCs has implications on non-reporting of their activities and financial data within global humanitarian flagship reporting mechanisms.

Perception about the impact of IDCs’ operations on principled humanitarianism is another critical area this research aspired to reflect on. This research, based on the findings of the literature review as well as case study of Pakistan, concludes that IDCs are no doubt emerging phenomenon on global aid-scape. They clearly have added extra capacity and attracted resources to the sector. However, unlike traditional humanitarian actors, whose core purpose of existence is saving lives and alleviating sufferings, the IDCs are driven by profit (Steets et al. 2009). Similarly, majority of the INGOs/NGOs interviewed in Pakistan were of the impression that IDCs are only concerned about their profit and are hardly motivated by humanitarian values. The fact that three out of four respondents from IDCs themselves, though operating in countries like Pakistan, did not know that whether or not their companies are following core humanitarian principles. Any such lack of clarity with regards to core humanitarian principles strengthens perception against IDCs as not being truly humanitarian. Merit noting that the profit orientation of the IDCs itself may be less problematic but at least this can lead to engagement in activities which are not humanitarian in nature. The example of Afghanistan where the UN hired contractors were also engaged in combat operations is one such reflection of the problematic (Steets et al. 2012).

Tax payment or otherwise by IDCs particularly in countries of their operations is another important area. Literature on the subject is hardly available hence the research could not exclusively work out this area. Nevertheless, the Case Study of Pakistan vaguely highlighted some aspects of this issue. Majority of the respondents from INGOs were of the impression that since the accounts of IDCs are centrally managed there is a high probability that these IDCs don’t pay taxes in countries where they basically earn the money. They further shared that IDCs normally award consultancy contracts to their employees and unlike majority of the traditional actors they don’t deduct tax from their employees at source. This gives the employees the possibility to evade tax on their income. This is a detailed area of research which this research did not specifically focus.

4.2 Recommendations

Drawing on the findings and conclusions, this research endeavors to put forward some recommendations. However, as noted in the methodology section, this research has certain methodological limitations hence it is merit noting that any individual or institution intending to
follow any of the recommendation should carefully consider the limitations. Another important declaration, again given the methodological constraint, would be that the recommendations are based on analysis of the data generated and my personal experience of this sector hence may not be without limitations. Therefore, the recommendations are not definitive but still may help guide researchers and institutions intending to explore certain areas more deeply than others. Considering these points, the research put forward the following key recommendations:

- IDCs certainly have a role in humanitarian system and there is a greater need to understand their role more deeply. Linked to this, the humanitarian system needs to clearly define that whether profit oriented interventions go along with the ideals of humanitarian imperative or there is a need for separate set of rules for profit motivated players?

- The humanitarian system may also like to devise a system at the level of each country of operations on how to make sure that IDCs’ data, particularly for humanitarian intervention is appropriately captured and reported. In parallel, the humanitarian system needs to decide that whether or not, the IDCs functional in humanitarian contexts can be part of UNOCHA’s cluster system if the situation necessitates activation of cluster system.

- This research recommends that humanitarian funding of IDCs should be reflected separate than that of traditional actors. This is only possible when IDCs report back on their data particularly financial data within FTS or any other agreed upon reporting mechanism. Or another possibility can be that the donors maintain separate record of funding to IDCs for humanitarian and development purposes and separately report within global reporting mechanisms.

- The research put forward a humble recommendation to donor countries and agencies for careful considerations on how their funding decisions may have obvious or even potential negative implications for traditional humanitarian actors in terms of retaining their humanitarian capacity.

- Another humble recommendation would be that since the IDCs certainly have technical capacities, the humanitarian system needs to work through creating spaces for more synergies among the IDCs and traditional humanitarian actors in responding to future emergencies. This is largely dependent on a collective decision by key stakeholders within humanitarian sector that whether or not they think that IDCs are part of the humanitarian paradigm.
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Annexure 1: Research Process

Research Process/Strategy

Research Problem → Research question(s) → Research Hypothesis

Literature Review:
- History/definitions/guidelines
- Policies
- Books, articles and global reports

Internet based search → Interviews → Results/Discussions

Context of Pakistan → Findings/conclusions → Recommendation
Annexure 2: Interview Plan

Interview plan

Population for the interview
- National NGOs
- International Development Contractors (IDCs)
- International NGOs

How does the delivery of humanitarian assistance by IDCs influence principled humanitarianism?

- Current funding mechanism
- Field operationalization
- Coordination and needs assessment
- Global reporting mechanism
- Future trends

Questionnaire plan
Annexure 3 A: Questionnaire INGO

Questionnaire for International NGOs

Purpose: The sole purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant information required for my research dissertation. The research dissertation is mandatory part of my Master Degree (Master of Advanced Studies in Humanitarian Action) at CERAH – a joint centre of University of Geneva and Geneva Graduate Institute, Geneva Switzerland. In order of understanding for the purpose of this research, I tend to consider for-profit companies such as Chemonics, Creative Associates, Adam Smith International, GRM, Coffey International, DAI etc. as International Development Contractors (IDCs).

1. General:

1.1 Name of the organization: ______________________________________________________

1.2 Since when working in Pakistan? __________________________________________________

1.3 Address of Head Office in Pakistan: ______________________________________________

1.4 Mandate of the organization: ☐ Humanitarian ☐ Development ☐ Dual

2. Funding:

2.1 Estimated Annual funding (US$): ☐ 0-10m ☐ 11-20 m ☐ 21-30m ☐ 31m and above

2.2 Estimated %age funding : Humanitarian: _______% Development:___________ %

2.3 Major funding sources:

☐ Institutional (DFID, USAID etc.)___________ %

☐ Members: _________________________ %

☐ Individuals: _______________________ %

☐ Any other: _________________________ %

2.4 In your opinion, funding for humanitarian and developmental activities over the last five years has:

1) ☐ Increased
2) ☐ decreased
3) ☐ unchanged

2.5 In your opinion, what are the major (present/future) funding challenges for INGOs in Pakistan?

• ______________________________________________________

• ______________________________________________________

• ______________________________________________________
2.6 Who you consider major competitors for funding in humanitarian/development sector?

1) ☐ NGOs
2) ☐ INGOs
3) ☐ UN
4) ☐ International Development Contractors (IDCs)
5) ☐ Govt. institutions (examples from Pakistan are PDMAs, FDMAs etc)
6) ☐ Any other (please Specify )

2.7 In your opinion, do the IDCs have any advantageous edge over INGOs ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.8 If yes, what exactly?

☐ Contracting out policy of some of the donors
☐ Cost effectiveness and efficiency
☐ High acceptability among the host governments
☐ Technology
☐ Possibility of working in less or non safe geographic areas
☐ Any other (please specify): 

3. Field Operations:

3.1 In which area of Pakistan, your organization is conducting its field operations?

1) ☐ Punjab
2) ☐ Khyber Pukhtoonkhwa
3) ☐ Sindh
4) ☐ Baluchistan
5) ☐ Gilgit Baltistan
6) ☐ FATA

3.2 Does any IDC implementing its activities in the same geographic areas? ☐ Yes ☐ No

3.3 If yes, in which thematic areas? Please tick relevant box(es).

1) ☐ Health
2) ☐ Education
3) ☐ Food Security and Livelihoods
4) ☐ Child Protection
5) ☐ Rule of law
6) □ DRR
7) □ Infrastructure
8) □ Any other: (please specify):

3.4 Who are/were the top active IDCs in Pakistan since the earthquake of 2005?
1. ________________  2. ________________  3. ________________
4. ________________  5. ________________  6. ________________
7. ________________  8. ________________  9. ________________
10. ________________

3.5 How these IDCs implement field activities?
- □ Self-implement
- □ Through implementing partners (INGOs, National or Local NGOs.
- □ Both
- □ Any other (specify) ________________________________

3.7 In your opinion, are these IDCs equipped for participatory and community based approaches to implement their activities? □ Yes  □ No

3.8 If not, to what extent these IDCs take into consideration the “do no harm” approach?
- □ Fully take do no harm approach
- □ Partially
- □ Don’t take consideration the “do no harm” approach

3.9 In your opinion, how the communities perceive the work of these IDCs?
- □ Humanitarian/developmental
- □ Sustainable and leading to self reliance
- □ Transparent and effective
- □ A substitute of INGOs
- □ For profit
- □ Not clear
- □ Any other (please specify): ________________________________

3.10 In your opinion, how the NGOs/INGOs perceive the work of these IDCs?
- □ Humanitarian/developmental
- □ Sustainable and leading to self reliance
- □ Transparent and effective
- □ For profit
- □ Harmful
- □ Not clear
- □ Any other (please specify): ________________________________
3.11 In your opinion, is there any advantageous edge of IDCs over INGOs? □ Yes □ No
3.12 If yes, what exactly?
   □ Technical capacity
   □ Technology
   □ Skilled Staff
   □ Quality implementation
   □ Out reach
   □ Any other (please specify) ____________________________________________
3.13 Do INGOs face any challenge in the field because of IDCs operations? □ Yes □ No
3.14 If yes, what are the major challenges at field level?
   □ Good quality implementation
   □ Poor quality implementation
   □ Over lapping of activities
   □ Perception of communities
   □ Lack of accountability towards communities
   □ Attracting skilled staff of INGOs (package + incentives)
   □ Any other (please specify) ____________________________________________

4. Coordination:

4.1 Do the IDCs participate in coordination mechanisms in place in country especially during emergencies? □ Yes □ No
4.2 If yes, which forum exactly?
   □ Cluster coordination
   □ Bi-lateral meeting with NGOs/INGOs at Head office level
   □ Bi-lateral meeting with NGOs/INGOs at field level
   □ Any other (please specify): ____________________________________________
4.3 Are these IDCs part of any of the following forum?
☐ Pakistan Humanitarian Forum (PHF)

☐ WASH cluster

☐ Food Security cluster

☐ Muliti cluster or inter cluster models in the country

☐ DRR group

☐ Pakistan Council for Philanthropy (PCP)

☐ Any other (please specify) ____________________________________________________________

4.4 In your opinion, do the IDCs follow the core humanitarian principles (Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality, Independence)  ☐ Yes ☐ No

4.5 Do they follow 3 Ws cluster reporting? ☐ yes ☐ No ☐ No idea

4.6 Do these IDCs report back on Financial Track System (FTS) managed by UN-OCHA?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ No idea

4.7 If not, how their funding is reflected at global level?

☐ Under the name of IDCs

☐ Under humanitarian Assistance

☐ No Idea

4.8 Are you aware of the global humanitarian reporting instruments such as World Disaster Report, Global Humanitarian Assistance Report etc.?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

4.9 Do you think that funding to IDCs for humanitarian/developmental activities should be reflected at global level as:

☐ Separate than NGOs/INGOs/UN funding

☐ Under the same funding heading “humanitarian assistance”

☐ Any other suggestion: ______________________________________________________________

5. Future trends:

5.1 In your opinion, what are the trends among major donors such as DFID, USAID, DFATD etc. concerning humanitarian/development funding in Pakistan?

☐ Grants
5.2 If “contracting out” is one of the preferred mode of engagement for donors, which player do you think is better placed to receive any such funding?

☐ UN
☐ NGOs/INGOs
☐ IDCs
☐ Consortium of NGOs/INGOs

5.3 In case of funding to consortium, which player do you think has better possibility to be “Fund manager”?

☐ UN
☐ NGOs/INGOs
☐ IDCs

5.4 Given the current security situation around INGOs (re-registration process) in Pakistan, which player(s) in your opinion are better placed to operate in country?

☐ UN
☐ NGOs/INGOs
☐ IDCs

Name of interviewee: _________________________________ Position in organization: ________

Date: _________________________________
Annexure 3 B: Questionnaire National NGOs

Questionnaire for National NGOs

**Purpose:** The sole purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant information required for my research dissertation. The research dissertation is mandatory part of my Master Degree (Master of Advanced Studies in Humanitarian Action) at CERAH – a joint centre of University of Geneva and Geneva Graduate Institute, Geneva Switzerland. In order of understanding for the purpose of this research, I tend to consider for-profit companies such as Chemonics, Creative Associates, Adam Smith International, GRM, Coffey International, DAI etc. as International Development Contractors (IDCs).

6. **General:**

1.1 Name of the organization: ______________________________________________________________

1.2 Since when the organization is working? __________________________________________________

1.3 Address of Head Office: ________________________________________________________________

1.4 Mandate of the organization: ☐ Humanitarian ☐ Development ☐ Dual ☐ Any other

7. **Funding:**

2.1 Estimated Annual funding (US$): ☐ 0-10m ☐ 11-20 m ☐ 21-30m ☐ 31m and above

2.2 Estimated %age funding : Humanitarian: ______% Development:___________%

2.3 Major funding sources:

☐ Institutional (DFID, USAID etc.) __________% ☐ UN______________________________%

☐ INGOs ________________________% ☐ IDCs______________________________%

☐ Members: ________________________% ☐ Individuals: ______________________%

☐ Any other: ______________________%

2.4 In your opinion, funding for humanitarian and developmental activities of national NGOs over the last five years has:

☐ Increased

☐ Decreased

☐ Unchanged

2.5 Who you consider major competitors for funding in humanitarian/development sector?

7) ☐ Fellow NGOs
8) ☐ INGOs
9) ☐ UN
10) ☐ IDCs
11) ☐ Govt. institutions (examples from Pakistan are PDMAs, FDMAs etc)
12) ☐ Any other (please Specify) ________________________________

2.6 In your opinion, does the role of IDCs has increased over the last decade in humanitarian/development sector in Pakistan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.7 If yes, what role exactly they are playing?

☐ humanitarian/development projects

☐ Fund management

☐ Technical role (capacity building of IPs)

☐ Any other (please specify) ________________________________

2.8 In your opinion, do the IDCs have any advantageous edge over INGOs? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.9 If yes, what exactly?

☐ Contracting out policy of some of the donors

☐ Cost effectiveness and efficiency

☐ High acceptability among the government of Pakistan

☐ Technology

☐ Possibility of working in less or non safe geographic areas

☐ Any other (please specify): ________________________________

2.10 Does your organization has ever received funding from any IDC? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.11 If yes, how did you find the relationship with that IDC?

☐ Partnership

☐ Contractorship

☐ Any other ________________________________

2.12 In your opinion, which one of the following is the best partner for national NGOs?

☐ INGOs

☐ IDC
2.13 In your opinion, what are the major (present/future) funding challenges for NGOs in Pakistan?

- 
- 
- 
- 

8. Field Operations:

3.1 In which area of Pakistan, your organization is conducting its field operations?

7) □ Punjab
8) □ Khyber Pukhtoonkhwa
9) □ Sindh
10) □ Baluchistan
11) □ Gilgit Baltistan
12) □ FATA

3.2 Does any IDC implementing its activities in the same geographic areas? □ Yes □ No

3.3 If yes, in which thematic areas? Please tick relevant box(es).

□ Health
□ Education
□ Food Security and Livelihoods
□ Child Protection
□ Rule of law
□ DRR
□ Infrastructure
□ Any other: (please specify): 

8.4 Who are/were the top active IDCs in Pakistan since the earthquake of 2005?

1. ________________ 2. ________________ 3. ________________
4. ________________ 5. ________________ 6. ________________
7. ________________ 8. ________________ 9. ________________
10. ________________

3.5 How these IDCs implement their humanitarian activities in the field?

□ Self-implement
□ Through implementing partners (INGOs, National or Local NGOs.
□ Both
□ Any other (specify) 

________________________
3.7 In your opinion, are these IDCs equipped for participatory and community based approaches to implement their activities? □ Yes □ No

3.8 If not, to what extent these IDCs take into consideration the “do no harm” approach?

□ Fully
□ Partially
□ Don’t take in consideration the “do no harm” approach

3.9 In your opinion, how the communities perceive the work of these IDCs?

□ Humanitarian/developmental
□ Sustainable and leading to self reliance
□ Transparent and effective
□ A substitute of INGOs
□ For profit
□ Not clear
□ Any other (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

3.10 How your NGO perceive the work of these IDCs?

□ Humanitarian/developmental
□ Sustainable and leading to self reliance
□ Transparent and effective
□ For profit
□ Harmful
□ Not clear
□ Any other (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

3.11 In your opinion, is there any operational advantageous edge of IDCs over INGOs? □ Yes □ No

3.12 If yes, what exactly?

□ Technical capacity
□ Technology
□ Skilled Staff
□ Quality implementation
□ Out reach
□ Any other (please specify) __________________________________________________________

3.13 Do you see, in comparison to INGOs, any value addition of IDCs delivering humanitarian assistance? □ Yes □ No
3.14 If yes, what exactly?

- Building local capacities
- Quality
- Efficiency and effectiveness compared to INGOs
- Sustainability

3.15 Which player among the following your organization would prefer to partner with for delivery of humanitarian assistance?

- IDC
- INGO

3.16 Do National NGOs face any challenge in the field because of IDCs’ operations?  

- Yes  
- No

3.14 If yes, what are the major challenges at field level?

- Funding
- Overlapping of activities
- Perception of communities
- Lack of accountability towards communities
- Attracting skilled staff of NGOs (package + incentives)
- Any other (please specify)  ____________________________________________________  __________________

9. Coordination:

4.1 Do the IDCs participate in coordination mechanisms in place in country especially during emergencies?  

- Yes  
- No

4.2 If yes, which forum exactly?

- Cluster coordination
- Bi-lateral meeting with NGOs/INGOs at Head office level
- Bi-lateral meeting with NGOs/INGOs at field level
- Any other (please specify):  ____________________________________________________

4.3 Are these IDCs part of any of the following forum?
4.4 In your opinion, do the IDCs follow the core humanitarian principles (Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality, Independence) □ Yes □ No

4.5 Do they follow 3Ws cluster reporting mechanism? □ yes □ No □ No idea

4.6 Do these IDCs report back on Financial Track System (FTS) managed by UN-OCHA?
□ Yes □ No □ No idea

4.7 If not, how their funding is reflected at global level?
□ Under the name of IDCs
□ Under humanitarian Assistance
□ No Idea

4.8 Are you aware of the global humanitarian reporting instruments such as World Disaster Report, Global Humanitarian Assistance Report etc.? □ Yes □ No

4.9 Do you think that funding to IDCs for humanitarian/developmental activities should be reflected at global level as:
□ Separate than NGOs/INGOs/UN funding
□ Under the same funding heading “humanitarian assistance”
□ Any other suggestion: ___________________________________________________________

10. Future trends:

5.1 In your opinion, what are the trends among major donors such as DFID, USAID, DFATD etc. concerning humanitarian/development funding in Pakistan?
□ Grants
☐ Contracting out

☐ Any other (please specify): ________________________________

5.2 If “contracting out” is one of the preferred mode of engagement for donors, which player do you think is better placed to receive any such funding?

☐ UN

☐ NGOs/INGOs

☐ IDCs

☐ Consortium of NGOs/INGOs

5.3 In case of funding to consortium, which player do you think has better possibility to be “Fund manager”?

☐ UN

☐ NGOs/INGOs

☐ IDCs

5.4 Who do you think among the following are the major recipient of humanitarian/developmental funding from USAID and DFID in Pakistan?

☐ NGOs/INGOs

☐ IDCs

5.5 Who do you foresee as major recipient of humanitarian/developmental funding from major donors such as USAID and DFID in the coming five years?

☐ NGOs/INGOs

☐ IDCs

5.6 Given the current security situation around INGOs (re-registration process) in Pakistan, which player(s) in your opinion are better placed to operate in country?

☐ UN

☐ NGOs/INGOs

☐ IDCs

Name of interviewee: _________________________________ Position in organization: _________

Date: ______________________________________
Annexure 3 C: Questionnaire for IDCs

Questionnaire for International Development Contractors (IDCs)

Purpose: The sole purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant information required for my research dissertation. The research dissertation is mandatory part of my Master Degree (Master of Advanced Studies in Humanitarian Action) at CERAH – a joint centre of University of Geneva and Geneva Graduate Institute, Geneva Switzerland. In order of understanding for the purpose of this research, I tend to consider for-profit companies such as Chemonics, Creative Associates, Adam Smith International, GRM, Coffey International, DAI etc. as International Development Contractors (IDCs).

11. General:

1.1 Name of the IDC:__________________________________________________________

1.2 Since when working in Pakistan?____________________________________________

1.3 Address of Head Office in Pakistan:_________________________________________

1.4 Does the IDC registered with Government of Pakistan? □ Yes □ No

1.5 If yes, under which Act/legal body?

□ Societies Act

□ MoU with Economic Affairs Division

□ Companies Act

□ Any other (please specify): ___________________________________________________

1.5 Mandate of the IDC: □ Humanitarian □ Development □ Dual

1.6 Is your organization tax exempted by the virtue of its status in Pakistan? □ Yes □ No

1.7 If not, does the organization pay tax on its income to the govt. of Pakistan? □ Yes □ No □ No Idea

12. Funding:

2.1 Estimated Annual funding (US$): □ 0-15m □ 16-30 m □ 31-45 m □ 46 m and above

2.2 Estimated %age funding: Humanitarian: _______% Development: _____________ %

2.3 Major funding sources:

□ Institutional (DFID, USAID etc.) _____________ %

□ Governments: ________________________ % (Please specify)
2.4 Who among the following are the major donors for your Organization over the last five years for humanitarian/developmental activities in Pakistan?

☐ USAID
☐ DFID
☐ DFATD
☐ Any other (Please specify): ________________________________%

2.5 In your opinion, funding to IDCs for humanitarian and developmental activities over the last five years has:

4) ☐ Increased
5) ☐ decreased
6) ☐ unchanged

2.6 Does your organization currently implement any mega project in Pakistan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.7 If yes, what sector exactly?

☐ Health and Nutrition
☐ Education
☐ Food Security and Livelihoods
☐ Infrastructure
☐ Rule of Law
☐ Governance
☐ Women empowerment
☐ Any other: ________________________________

2.8 Does your organization currently part of any consortium for implementation of humanitarian/developmental activities in Pakistan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.9 If yes, in what capacity?

☐ Member of the consortium
☐ Fund Manager
☐ Any other: ________________________________

2.10 In your opinion, what are the major (present/future) funding challenges for IDCs in Pakistan?
2.11 Who you consider major competitors for funding in humanitarian/development sector?

13) ☐ NGOs
14) ☐ INGOs
15) ☐ UN
16) ☐ Govt. institutions (examples from Pakistan are PDMAs, FDMAs etc)
17) ☐ Any other (please specify) __________________________________________________________________________

2.12 In your opinion, do the IDCs have any advantageous edge over INGOs ☐ Yes ☐ No

2.13 If yes, what exactly?

☐ Contracting out policy of some of the donors
☐ Cost effectiveness and efficiency
☐ High acceptability among the host governments
☐ Technical capacity (fund management etc.)
☐ Technology
☐ Possibility of working in less or non safe geographic areas
☐ Any other (please specify): __________________________________________________________________________

13. Field Operations:

3.1 In which area of Pakistan, your organization is implementing its projects?

13) ☐ Punjab
14) ☐ Khyber Pukhtoonkhwa
15) ☐ Sindh
16) ☐ Baluchistan
17) ☐ Gilgit Baltistan
18) ☐ FATA

3.2 Under which thematic areas your organization is implementing its activities?

☐ Health
☐ Education
☐ Food Security and Livelihoods
☐ Child Protection
☐ Rule of law
☐ DRR
☐ Infrastructure
3.3 Does any INGO implementing its activities in the same geographic areas? □ Yes □ No

3.4 If yes, in which thematic areas? Please tick relevant box(es).

□ Health
□ Education
□ Food Security and Livelihoods
□ Child Protection
□ Rule of law
□ DRR
□ Infrastructure
□ Any other: (please specify):

3.5 Who are/were the top active IDCs in Pakistan since the earthquake of 2005?
1. ________________ 2. ____________ 3. ________________
4. ________________ 5. ____________ 6. ________________
7. ________________ 8. ____________ 9. ________________
10. __________________

3.6 How your organization is implementing its field activities in Pakistan?

□ Self-implement
□ Through implementing partners
□ INGOs □ National or Local NGOs.
□ Both
□ Any other (specify) ________________________________

3.7 Do you think your organization is well equipped for participatory and community based approaches to implement its activities? □ Yes □ No

3.8 If not, to what extent your organization takes into consideration the “do no harm” approach?

□ Fully take do no harm approach
□ Partially
□ Don’t take consideration the “do no harm” approach

3.9 In your opinion, how the communities perceive the work of your organization?

□ Humanitarian/developmental
□ A substitute of INGOs
□ For profit
□ Not clear
□ Any other (please specify): ________________________________
3.10 In your opinion, how the NGOs/INGOs perceive the work of your organization?

- Humanitarian/developmental
- A substitute of INGOs
- For profit
- Not clear
- Any other (please specify): _________________________________

3.11 What do you think is the advantageous edge (operationally) of your organization over INGOs?

- Technical capacity
- Technology
- Skilled Staff
- Quality implementation
- Out reach
- Any other (please specify) _________________________________

3.12 Do you think involvement of target communities in humanitarian/developmental activities is important?  □ Yes  □ No

3.13 If yes, how your organization involves local communities?

- Implement projects in consultation with communities
- Implement project jointly with communities
- Implement project through community organizations
- Implementation by communities
- Any other _________________________________

14. Coordination:

4.1 Does your organization participate in coordination mechanisms in place in country especially during emergencies?  □ Yes  □ No

4.2 If yes, which forum exactly?

- Cluster coordination
- Bi-lateral meeting with NGOs/INGOs at Head office level
- Bi-lateral meeting with NGOs/INGOs at field level
4.3 Is your organization part of any of the following forum?

☐ Pakistan Humanitarian Forum (PHF)
☐ WASH cluster
☐ Food Security cluster
☐ Multi cluster or inter cluster models in the country
☐ DRR group
☐ Pakistan Council for Philanthropy (PCP)
☐ Scaling up Nutrition (SUN) – CSO Alliance
☐ Development Partners for Nutrition (DPN)
☐ Any other (please specify): ___________________________________________________

4.4 Has your organization been part of any joint Assessment mission during/post emergency responses in Pakistan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4.5 If yes, what exactly?

☐ Multi-Cluster Inter Agency Rapid Assessment (MIRA)
☐ Collaboration with NGO/INGO
☐ Any other: ________________________________________________________________

4.6 If never been part of joint assessment, how does your organization assess local needs?

☐ Secondary data
☐ Individual assessment
☐ Rely on NGOs/INGOs’ assessment reports
☐ Any other: ________________________________________________________________

4.7 In your opinion, does your organization follow the core humanitarian principles (Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality, Independence) especially during emergency response? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4.8 If not, what principles does the organization follow exactly?

1. ________________________________________________________________
2. __________________________________________________________

3. __________________________________________________________

4.9 Does your organization follow 3Ws cluster reporting? ☐ yes ☐ No ☐ No idea

4.10 Does your organization reports back on Financial Track System (FTS) managed by UN-OCHA?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ No idea

4.11 If not, how the organizational funding is reflected at global level?
☐ Under the name of IDCs
☐ Under humanitarian Assistance
☐ No Idea

4.12 Are you aware of the global humanitarian reporting instruments such as World Disaster Report, Global Humanitarian Assistance Report etc.? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4.13 Do you think that funding to IDCs for humanitarian/developmental activities should be reflected at global level as:
☐ Separate than NGOs/INGOs/UN funding
☐ Under the same funding heading “humanitarian assistance”
☐ Any other suggestion: ___________________________________________

15. Future trends:

5.1 In your opinion, what are the trends among major donors such as DFID, USAID, DFATD etc. concerning humanitarian/development funding in Pakistan?
☐ Grants
☐ Contracting out
☐ Any other (please specify): _______________________________________

5.2 If “contracting out” is one of the preferred mode of engagement for donors, which player do you think is better placed to receive any such funding?
☐ UN
☐ NGOs/INGOs
☐ IDCs
Consortium of NGOs/INGOs

5.3 In case of funding to consortium, which player do you think has better possibility to be “Fund manager”?

☐ UN
☐ NGOs/INGOs
☐ IDCs

15.4 Given the current security situation around INGOs (re-registration process) in Pakistan, which player(s) in your opinion are better placed to operate in country?

☐ UN
☐ NGOs/INGOs
☐ IDCs

Name of interviewee: _________________________________ Position in organization: __________

Date: _________________________________
### Annexure 4: Profiles of respondent organizations

**Table 1: Profiles of Respondent Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>S.#</th>
<th>Respondent Organizations</th>
<th>Presence in Pakistan</th>
<th>Location of main office in Pakistan</th>
<th>Mandate of the organization</th>
<th>Operational areas</th>
<th>Name and position of interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Punjab and Sindh</td>
<td>Shahida Arif, Head DRR and Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>KP and FATA</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IR world wide</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>KP, Sindh and Baluchistan</td>
<td>Umair Hassan, Regional Humanitarian Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Action Aid</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Punjab, KP and Sindh</td>
<td>Ifikhar Kazmi, Country Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development Contractors (IDCs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DAI</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Punjab, KP &amp; Sindh</td>
<td>Zeeshan Noel, Program Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coffey International</td>
<td></td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td></td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adam Smith International</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Punjab &amp; KP</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mott McDonald</td>
<td>2009*</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Punjab, KP, Sindh &amp; Baluchistan</td>
<td>Farooq Azam, Team Leader TRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Swat</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Akbar Zeb, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HRDS</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Punjab, KPK, Sindh, FATA</td>
<td>Muhammad Tariq Jan, Regional Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BEFARE</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Punjab, KP &amp; Sindh</td>
<td>Ifikhar Ali Khan, Deputy Chief of Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Interviews with individual organizations

*Mott MacDonald is operational in Pakistan for the last over 50 years mainly power sector with construction of mega projects such as Ghazi Barotha Hydropower Project. After HLSP and Cambridge Education, Mott McDonalds has started implementing health and education project in Pakistan since 2009 (N/A 2016).
Annexure 5: Perception of funding environment

Table 2: Perception with regards to humanitarian/development funding environment over the last five years in Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Organizations</th>
<th>S.#</th>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Estimated Annual funding (US$ million)</th>
<th>%age share</th>
<th>Main funding sources</th>
<th>Funding situation for INGOs/IDCs/NGOs in Pakistan over last 5 years</th>
<th>major competitors for funding</th>
<th>Do the IDCs have advantageous edge over INGos?</th>
<th>If Yes, what exactly?</th>
<th>Major funding challenges for INGOs/IDCs/NGOs in Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>21-30 m</td>
<td>60 40 60 30 10</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>INGOs, NGOs and IDCs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access, • Security issues, • No Major Emergency (declared) by GOP, • Scale and nature of emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>INGOs and IDCs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IR worldwide</td>
<td>11-20m</td>
<td>25 75 38 62</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access/NOCs, Global impact, Diversion of contracting out IDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Action Aid</td>
<td>0-10m</td>
<td>20 80 20 80</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donor policies, Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development Contractors (IDCs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DAI</td>
<td>46m and above</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>INGOs, UN and Govt.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness, Technology and technical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coffey International</td>
<td>0-15m</td>
<td>0 100 100 0</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adam smith International</td>
<td>31-46m</td>
<td>10 0 100 0</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>INGOs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost Effectiveness, working in non-safe areas and technical capacity NoC for consultants, Security issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mott McDonald</td>
<td>11-20m</td>
<td>10 0 100 0</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High acceptance within govt., visibility over issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>11-20m</td>
<td>70 30 30 10</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contracting out NoC, Less transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>HRDS</td>
<td>11-20m</td>
<td>80 20 100 0</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contracting out, Contrasting out, Working in non-safe areas and technical capacity Less funding NoC, Security issues, some unethical conditions from some of the funding partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BEFARE</td>
<td>11-20m</td>
<td>80 20 100 0</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>INGOs, NGOs, IDCs and Govt</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Individual interviews with respondent organizations
Annexure 6: Perception about field operations of IDCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Organization</th>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Overlapping geography/sectors</th>
<th>Who are the major IDCs in Pakistan?</th>
<th>Implementation modalities of IDCs</th>
<th>Are IDCs fully equipped for participatory approaches?</th>
<th>Community perception about the work of IDCs</th>
<th>INGOs/NGOs perception about the work of IDCs</th>
<th>Is there any operational advantage of IDCs over INGOs/NGOs?</th>
<th>DO NGOs/INGOs face any challenge due to IDCs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National NGOs</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Health, Education, Rule of Law, DRR and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>Substitutes for INGOs</td>
<td>Substitutes for profit</td>
<td>Technically equipped for profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRDS</td>
<td>Punjab, KP and FATA</td>
<td>Health and Education</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>Humanitarian, Sustainable and Transparent</td>
<td>Technical expertise, skilled staff and quality implementation</td>
<td>Funding and attracting skilled staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEFARE</td>
<td>Punjab, KP and Sindh</td>
<td>Health, Education, FSL, Rule of Law</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>Humanitarian, Sustainable and Transparent</td>
<td>Technical expertise, skilled staff and quality implementation</td>
<td>Funding and attracting skilled staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International NGOs</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Punjab and Sindh</td>
<td>Education, DRR</td>
<td>DAI, GRM, IMC and Coffey International</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Substitute to INGOs</td>
<td>For profit</td>
<td>Financial Risk Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Palladium, Coffey, DAI, Chemonics, Mott McDonal, Mechanz</td>
<td>Substituting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Substitute to INGOs</td>
<td>For Profit</td>
<td>Technical capacity (fund management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ActionAid</td>
<td>Punjab, KP and Sindh</td>
<td>Education, FSL, Rule of Law, DRR and Infrastructure</td>
<td>DAI, Coffey, Mott McDonald, Paladin and IMC</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Not clear</td>
<td>For Profit</td>
<td>Technical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: individual interviews
### Annexure 7: Coordination

**Table 4: Perception of Respondent Organizations with regards to Coordination during emergencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Organizations</th>
<th>Name of Organizations</th>
<th>Do the IDCs participate in coordination mechanism during emergencies?</th>
<th>Do the IDCs follow the core humanitarian principles?</th>
<th>Do they follow 3 Ws cluster reporting?</th>
<th>Do these IDCs report back on Financial Track system managed by UN-OCHA?</th>
<th>If not, how their funding is reflected at global level?</th>
<th>Are you aware of the global humanitarian flagship reports?</th>
<th>How the funding to IDCs for humanitarian/development should be reflected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International NGOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Same heading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR worldwide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ActionAid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Development Contractors (IDCs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffey International</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Smith International</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National NGOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEFARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>No Idea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate than INGOs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Individual interviews
## Table 5: Perception about future trends in humanitarian sector in Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Organizations</th>
<th>Name of Organizations</th>
<th>Trends among major donors such as DFID, USAID, DFATD</th>
<th>which player is better placed, if &quot;contracting out&quot; is one of the preferred mode of engagement for donors?</th>
<th>In case of funding to consortium, which player do you think has better possibility to be &quot;Fund Manager&quot;?</th>
<th>Who in the opinion of National NGOs are the potential funding recipient for funding from donors such as USAID and DFID?</th>
<th>Given the current security situation around INGOs in Pakistan, which player do you think is better placed to operate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International NGOs</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Contracting out</td>
<td>Consortium + IDCs</td>
<td>NGOs/INGOs</td>
<td>UN + NGOs</td>
<td>UN + NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>Contracting Out + Grants (Both)</td>
<td>IDCs + Consortium</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Did not answer this</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ActionAid</td>
<td>Contracting out</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>Depends on the nature of call</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Contractors (IDCs)</td>
<td>DAI</td>
<td>Grants*</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffey International</td>
<td>Contracting out</td>
<td>UN and IDCs</td>
<td>Depends on the nature of call</td>
<td>UN +(IDC)</td>
<td>UN + IDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam smith International</td>
<td>Contracting Out + Grants (Both)</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>UN +(IDC)</td>
<td>UN + IDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mott McDonald</td>
<td>Grants** + Bilateral funding</td>
<td>INGOs/NGOs/NGOs</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>UN and IDCs</td>
<td>UN and IDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National NGOs</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>Contracting out</td>
<td>IDCs, Consortium of INGOs/NGOs</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRDS</td>
<td>Contracting out</td>
<td>NGOs/NGOs/NGOs</td>
<td>NGOs/NGOs</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEFARE</td>
<td>Contracting out</td>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>Depends on the nature of call</td>
<td>IDCs</td>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Individual interviews

* IDCs are also implementing grants

** DFID TRF funding to Mott McDonalds is also grant

*** IDCs, like INGOs, are not required to re-register themselves under the current security situation in Pakistan