Bridging the gaps?
Practitioner’s attitudes and understanding of the temporal, institutional and funding gaps between humanitarian and development assistance
Abstract
Due to an increased humanitarian caseload the UN has called for the international community to work differently from delivering aid to ending needs, partly by enhancing the engagement between humanitarian and development actors. The thesis aims to describe and analyse the dynamics between humanitarian and development aid and by so doing provide an empirical contribution to the larger discussion on how to streamline international assistance by addressing the temporal, institutional and funding gaps between the two types of assistance. This is a qualitative comparative study based on nine interviews with development and humanitarian practitioners from five different organisations providing both types of assistance. Participants of the study were positive to the idea of collaboration across the sectors but that in order to accomplish this the international community, donors and each individual organisation need to overcome great institutional and financial constraints leading to the conclusion that international assistance will not be streamlined successfully until the institutional and funding gaps are properly addressed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT- Alliance</td>
<td>Actions by Churches Together Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>Core Humanitarian Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Head Quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRRD</td>
<td>Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>Medicins Sans Frontieres/ Doctors Without Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Nongovernmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRM</td>
<td>Rapid Response Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>Swedish Mission Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Swedish Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISDR</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>World Humanitarian Summit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1 Background and problem formulation

Earthquakes, floods, heat waves and landslides killed 22,773, affected 98.6 million and caused 66.5 billion dollars of economic damage in 2015, putting the humanitarian needs at an all time high (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction [UNISDR], 2016) and the trends, sadly, do not instil any hope. The international community is in agreement that the way in which humanitarian assistance has been provided needs to change (Stylianides, 2015; World Humanitarian Summit [WHS], 2016). Humanitarian assistance has been good, but it has not been good enough. There is a general recognition in the international community of a need to move from reactive to preventive action. Former United Nations (UN) Secretary-General Ban Ki Mon has initiated the Agenda for Humanity where one of the commitments is to work differently to end needs. In the first ever World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) global leaders recognised that humanitarian assistance no longer can be viewed in isolation from broader sustainable development efforts and must commit to a new way of working that not only meet people’s needs but reduces them by reducing risks and vulnerabilities, with a commitment from participants to reinforce the coping strategies of the affected communities (WHS, 2016).

Those not practicing in the field of humanitarian or development aid understand the two as a composite civilian segments of the international apparatus (Harland Sande Lie, 2015:1) and beneficiaries make no distinction whether the assistance they receive comes through humanitarian or development actors. While both fields have the same objective of improving living conditions of people in need, what they can do, how they can do it and for how long is dependent on what section it comes from, at least theoretically and strategically. The two institutions have been operating concurrently for decades and it was not until the 1980’s during the food security crisis in Africa there was a realisation that there was a significant gap in the thinking around international assistance (Audet, 2015:112). The gaps appear in different ways and originate in the emergence of two separate systems with different priorities, cultures and rationales, which causes difficulty when trying to bridge the two sectors for a holistic approach.
1.2 Knowledge gap and scientific contribution

Parlance, budgets, policies and practices of the UN systems and donors traditionally operate with a clear distinction between humanitarian and development aid (Stamnes, 2016:1). The increased recognition among these organisations of the need for collaboration between the two in order to achieve effective and sustainable change has met challenges. The relationship between the distinct sectors has been conceptualised as a gap but is in reality a collection of different gaps that obstruct the opportunity to work in simultaneous collaboration. Policy-makers and academia, in particular literature on Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD), have identified the gaps, but how they are perceived and experienced by practitioners and how they can be overcome is yet to be addressed. In an article of what Resilience is coming to mean for the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), Ian Christoplos (2014:88) argues that even though there are debates about definitions, theories and models around development, these do not always correlate with the understanding of the concepts among practitioners of humanitarian and development aid and Legaspi and Nararatwong (2014:549) argues that the perception of something will catalyse our behaviour. This is why it is important to investigate the perceptions of the tensions between humanitarian and development assistance by their respective practitioners. This thesis will contribute with empirical understanding of how practitioners in both humanitarian and development aid perceive and experience the gaps between the two sectors. Through a new analytical perspective this thesis will contribute to the larger discussion, both in policy and academia, how to provide more sustainable international assistance by addressing the current obstruction of the way forward spoken of by a majority of the international community.

This thesis will use the term humanitarian as a generic term for terms such as relief assistance and emergency aid. Development will similarly serve as a generic term for all activities that are long-term and not seen as humanitarian1.

---

1 Humanitarian and development are central concepts in this thesis and will be discussed further down however; the following definition taken from Sida can serve as a foundation until the more detailed definitions are presented. Humanitarian aid has as a goal to save lives, alleviate suffering and establish dignity for people affected by different disaster situations. Development is about supporting long-term poverty reduction and democracy processes (Swedish International Development Agency [Sida], n.d).
1.3 Aim and Research Questions
The aim of this thesis is to describe and analyse the dynamics between humanitarian and development sectors and how these dynamics affect the opportunity to collaborate to achieve sustainable results. This study will answer the following research questions:

- How do practitioners from Nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) in Sweden, working with both humanitarian and development assistance, understand the gaps between humanitarian and development assistance?
- How do the attitudes and understanding among practitioners of Humanitarian and Development assistance respectively affect the opportunity to collaborate?
- What activities can be identified as ways to bridge the gaps?

1.4 Outline of the thesis
Chapter 2 will present the basic distinctions between humanitarianism and development as well as address previous discussions around a gap between humanitarian and development efforts. It will specifically address the concepts of development-relief and Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD), which serve as a foundation to the theoretical framework and as such naturally leads in to chapter 3. This chapter presents the theoretical framework that takes form of three different gaps; temporal, institutional and financial. Chapter 4 presents the methodological procedures taken in this study in terms of selection of data, analytical method, ethical consideration and so on. Chapter 5 will be a presentation of the results of my data collection. A short presentation of the participating organisation will be followed by the general findings from the interviews with development and humanitarian practitioners from five different organisations. Chapter 6 will be a discussion on the data from chapter 5 applied to the theoretical framework from chapter 3. The thesis will end with chapter 7 in the form of a conclusion.

2. Previous Research
To first understand the tensions between humanitarian and development practices it is important to try define the respective concepts, and if possible, the practices. However this is
also part of the problem with trying to bridge the two, in that there are different views of what ‘humanitarian’ and ‘development’ entails and there are more areas that are grey than black and white (Koddenbrock & Büttner, 2009:119). Having said that, it is important to at least attempt to make some kind of distinction.

2.1 Humanitarianism

Humanitarian action is defined by ALNAP as “assistance, protection and advocacy actions undertaken on an impartial basis in response to human needs resulting from complex political emergencies and natural hazards.” United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) defines Humanitarian assistance as “aid that seeks to save lives and alleviate suffering of a crisis-affected population…Assistance may be divided into three categories—direct assistance, indirect assistance and infrastructure support—which have diminishing degrees of contact with the affected population” (Reliefweb, 2008).

Michael Barnett (2011) makes the distinction between emergency humanitarianism and alchemical humanitarianism. The former refers to the practice of providing emergency relief to those in immediate peril and the latter includes saving lives at risk but also aims to address the root causes of suffering. The definitions from ALNAP and OCHA follow more the lines of emergency humanitarianism with little room from the OCHA definition to be classified as alchemical humanitarianism. Barnett’s two different types of humanitarianism are different responses to one of the fundamental problems faced by humanitarian actors: how to live in a world of states and actors that are often responsible for the very suffering they want to relieve. Humanitarian agencies have responded to this dilemma by adopting different kinds of principles (Barnett, 2011:22). The principles first adopted by the Red Cross and Crescent Society of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence are now recognised as the “humanitarian principles”. Humanity commands attention to all humankind. Impartiality demands that assistance be made independent of things such as nationality, race, religion, gender and political opinion. Neutrality means that humanitarian organisations do not take part in any action that disadvantage or benefit the parties of the conflict. Independence is closely related to neutrality and impartiality and is included occasionally referring to the demand that the assistance provided is not connected to the parties or stakeholders directly involved with the conflict (Barnett, 2011:33) These principles come to play different roles depending on what type of humanitarianism is exercised but in essence they allow for humanitarian agencies to be seen as apolitical and innocent by association (Barnett, 2011:34).
These principles play, at least theoretically, a significant role in the potential for humanitarian sectors to collaborate with the development sector. As will be discussed further down. However, at least when it comes to alchemical humanitarianism, there is no clear line between relief, rehabilitation and development and no precise definition of what is what exists.

2.2 Development

Development assistance grew out of the post-colonial period and deals with reducing poverty, promote adherence to human rights increase human security and democratisation. It is more long-term oriented and is largely achieved through close cooperation with the receiving government or civil society (Koddenbrock & Büttner, 2009:120). The UN has defined sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability for future generation to meet their own needs” (United Nations [UN], n.d.). The three core elements of sustainable development are economic growth, social inclusion and environmental protection. While humanitarians cling to the principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality, development aid usually comes with clear political agendas. Development is insensitive to crisis and emergency aid is short-term in nature and insensitive to the intervention that follows (Mosel and Levine 2014:3). Even though there are differences between humanitarian and development activities there are also differences within the development sector including economists, climate change specialists, urban planners, peace- and state-building specialists and so on, and all of which have different approaches (Carpenter and Barrett, 2015:2).

2.3 The Humanitarian-Development Gap

The discussions around the humanitarian-development divide can be seen in different aspects of international aid. One aspect is the “mission creep”, which refers to the fact that organisations, out of necessity, need to move beyond their original mandate to that of mandates normally held by other actors, or mandates without the clarity of who should act. For instance protracted crisis has led refugee aid organisations such as United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to have to consider issues that would normally go under the development sector, one example being when their mandate extended from repatriation to reintegration (Crisp, 2001:179). Another example is during protracted crisis and refugee camps turn in to long-lasting societies, humanitarian assistance naturally moves increasingly from service provision to systems building, moving from their originally clear humanitarian mandate and instead have to take in to considerations issues such as education, long-term healthcare services and livelihoods. Crisp (2001:189) points to arguments that
moving from their original mandate risks the quality of the UNHCR work and Gabiam (2012) argues that in the case of Palestinian refugee camps that moving from humanitarian to development activities has political implications to the conflict and not necessarily beneficial for the affected population. These examples illustrate the need for collaboration between the different aid sector to ensure quality and to avoid negative effects.

2.3.1 Development-Relief and LRRD
The United States (US) administration and the European Union (EU) are some of the largest actors in terms of international aid and both have similar policies in terms of how humanitarian and development action should be linked. The US administration uses the term Development-relief and defines it as “an approach that encourages the programmatic linkages of the emergency and development objectives” (Steets, 2011:12). Development-Relief programs encompass development conscious emergency programs; emergency conscious development programs and enhance community and household resilience (Steets, 2011:12). The European equivalent of Development-relief is called Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD); a concept first adopted by the European Commission and seeks to promote a more holistic approach to international assistance (Steets 2011:12). Development-relief and LRRD are essentially two concepts for the same thing. The disconnect has been addressed in three distinct, interrelated aspects: 1. Addressing development principles early on in the emergency setting. 2. Ensuring a smooth transition as well as continuity and coordination between assistance forms on the ground and 3. Using development cooperation to support prevention and disaster risk reduction (Steets, 2011:12). Even though the concept of LRRD has been around for a long time there is no common understanding of its nature, scope and operational relevance (Koddenbrock & Büttner, 2009:119). There is no unique model or blueprint how to address LRRD as every situation is different and it is highly dependent on the individual contexts but principles such as flexibility, risk-taking and openness to learning, working with local institutions, thorough context and political analysis, joint analysis and learning at country level and realistic programming (Mosel and Levine, 2014:13-16).

2.3.2 New approach?
There are several policy papers and reports of challenges and successes in projects concerning LRRD, however while the international community still recognises the need for coherence
between relief and development, the focus has shifted to the concept of resilience. While LRRD focuses on the behaviour of the actors delivering assistance, resilience puts the focus on the recipients of the assistance. The recent focus on strengthening resilience has prompted new thinking on better integrating humanitarian and development approaches on a common understanding of risk (Carpenter and Bennett, 2015:2).

However, like LRRD, Resilience programs need the facilitation of both humanitarian and development assistance to be effective. LRRD and resilience are both arguments for bridging the gap between humanitarian and development efforts but fail to address the obstacles to such a bridge. What neither approach addresses however, is how these obstacles identified can be overcome and what practitioners themselves see as merits and challenges with trying to bridge the gap. Even though both LRRD and resilience are approaches that provide a more holistic view of international assistance, this thesis will not discuss what these kinds of programs entail, but rather the obstacles that hinder these programs to be successful. The aim of bridging the humanitarian-development divide is ultimately to have a holistic and sustainable approach to providing assistance to the people in need. The disconnect between humanitarian and development sectors has been conceptualised as a gap by the international community. However, through the research conducted on the humanitarian-development nexus and in particular publications on Development-Relief and LRRD, I have identified three distinct gaps that need to be addressed in order facilitate better collaboration between the two sectors, which will be presented in the next chapter.

3. Theory

Policy and academics have identified a gap between humanitarian and development relationship. This is in reality a collection of several gaps. These gaps obstruct the opportunity for collaboration between the sectors and must be addressed in order for policies on Development-relief, LRRD or Resilience to have a chance at success. Having said that it is important to point out that the link should not be the end in itself; it is just the means in accomplishing better assistance with sustainable results. In the literature these gaps are conceptualised in different ways. Through the study of different scholarly work on the subject I have identified three distinct gaps that are the main obstacles to achieving some kind of link and have conceptualised these on the basis mainly LRRD literature. These gaps are the temporal, institutional and funding gaps.
Different scholarly and policy papers have contributed to the inspiration and source for the different gaps. The main sources of inspiration for the temporal and institutional gaps are Mosel and Levine, Koddenbrock and Büttner, Suhrke and Ofstad (2005) and Audet (2015). Mosel and Levine (2014) write that the difficulty of implementing LRRD approaches is because it has been interpreted as one-sided and linear and calls for a reinterpretation of the concept. Koddenbrock and Büttner (2009) assess the LRRD approaches by the EU and US government and argue that the systematic tensions between humanitarian and development sectors need to be tackled. Suhrke and Ofstad (2005) address the response to the gap problem with a focus on multilateral aid agencies in the UN system. Audet (2015) discusses in his article the difficulties with implementing LRRD approaches. In terms of the funding gap Julia Steets’ (2011) report Donor Strategies for Addressing the Transition Gap and Linking Humanitarian and Development Assistance served as a foundation where she discusses the additional complexities to linking humanitarian and development brought about by the donor systems. Ian Christoplos article on resilience also served as a contribution to the description of the funding gap (Christoplos, 2014).

3.1 The Temporal Gap

The idea of a temporal gap can be found in the LRRD approach in that there is space between the relief, rehabilitation and development efforts. The gap has been identified as the time after which humanitarian agencies leave an area once a crisis has subsided but before incoming development agencies have established programs (Mendenhall, 2014:67).

The linear thinking has dominated policy discussions and formulations. The linear thinking in humanitarian terms has in practice been the focus on clear exit-strategies that prepare for the next aid phase (Mosel and Levine 2014:3). This can be effective in some cases but in cases pertaining to recurring or protracted crises humanitarian assistance usually becomes prolonged and often moves beyond the core mandate. Current emergencies do not move in a predictable linear fashion and as has been noted by LRRD advocates (Koddenbrock & Büttner, 2009:122), different population groups may have different needs at the same time, and as such there is a need for different sorts of aid instruments to be applied simultaneously, particularly in protracted crises. In order to implement such thinking first the assumption of specific time-slots for humanitarian and development assistance need to be addressed.
The temporal gap comes in two forms, it is recurring crisis where development programs are constantly disrupted by crisis, causing the development to slow down, be paused or even cancelled (see figure 1 below). The other form of temporal gap is in protracted crisis where needs are mixed between humanitarian nature, such as saving lives through food distribution, and development nature such as education, food security and recovery. However, the lack of links between humanitarian and development actors causes delays in the transition between these and two parallel systems are created instead (see figure 3 and 4).

**Figure 1: Recurring Crisis**

Source: Author

Note: Figure 1 shows in simple terms how the temporal gap is manifest in recurring crisis. The blue line represent development programs, the star represent a crisis and the red line represent humanitarian action. The graph shows how development programs are disrupted by a crisis and humanitarian action steps in immediately. The time in which humanitarian action is necessary vary between crises, but the figure shows a time between the end of a humanitarian response and the re-launch or initiation of development programs, that often will need to start from scratch. This is what in simple terms explains the temporal gap between humanitarian and development action.
Figure 2: The ideal in recurring crisis

Source: Author

Note: The ideal of not having a temporal gap between humanitarian and development action is shown in figure 2. Here the development work would be formed with clear understanding of risks, needs and capacities (illustrated with a purple line) so that when a crisis happens humanitarian efforts can focus on saving lives and alleviating suffering with a clear understanding of the context. Local development partners could for instance play a role in the needs and capacity assessments. When the emergency phase has subsided the humanitarian exit is coordinated with the incoming development efforts so that there is a smooth transition and the programs are designed or altered based on lessons learned from the crisis.
Figure 3: Protracted crisis

Source: Author

Note: Figure 3 is a simple illustration of how two parallel systems are created in protracted crisis because of the lack of links between humanitarian and development action. The red representing humanitarian action and the blue representing development are executed in separate systems without any collaboration.
Related to exit strategies the gap is also a product of the question of who decides when and how relief should scale down and give way for rehabilitation. Working in crisis mode for too long is neither sustainable nor cost effective but without rehabilitation and development interventions to take over there it may be necessary as development actors find the context not ready for their long-term efforts (Otto, 2013:42). Even though coherence has improved within the humanitarian field through cluster systems and pooled funding, there is a need for some kind of coherence between humanitarian and development fields.

One part of the problem with the linear thinking and the temporal gap between humanitarian and development assistance is that crisis still tends to be seen as independently determined (Mosel and Levine, 2015:5). Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) efforts for instance have largely
had a technical focus and often exclude socio-political aspects of risk and vulnerability. This sort of approach reinforces the linear thinking and limits the ability to have an emergency thinking in development context and development thinking in humanitarian context. The different mandates of humanitarian and development assistance, in that the former is characterised as short term and expected to solve problems quickly while the latter is expected to work with underlying issues, also adds to a temporal separation of the two forms of aid.

Part of the problem again, lies in the lack of definitions of the terms such as relief, rehabilitation, development and transition and policies and practices can get muddled up in trying to come up with common definitions, with the risk of losing touch of what is important. The Sida Humanitarian Assistance Policy describes it well: ‘In reality humanitarian assistance and development cooperation are often being implemented side by side, which mean that they complement and interact with one another.’ (Department for Development Policy & the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 2011)

### 3.1.1 How is the temporal gap observable?

The temporal gap can be identified in Head Quarters (HQ) level by lack of coordination between the humanitarian and development sector, in particular at the end of a humanitarian project and beginning of a development project. The coordination could be a position held by staff but can also be the collaboration between the staff in the humanitarian and development sections. This can be made apparent through an answer to the following interview question:

*In a situation where humanitarian efforts are transitioned in to development efforts, or when development efforts need to transition to humanitarian efforts, how is that transition coordinated at the HQ?*

### 3.2 The Institutional Gap

There are fundamental differences between humanitarian and development institutions in priorities, cultures and mandates and Mosel and Levine (2014:7) argue that the most fundamental challenge to operationalising LRRD lies in reconciling the fundamentally different institutional cultures, assumptions, values structures and ways of working that characterise the humanitarian and development communities. The traditional humanitarian approach was mostly micro-oriented providing immediate life-saving services. Development
actors on the other hand are more macro-oriented, working in partnerships with both civil society organisations and government authorities (Suhrke and Ofstad, 2002:14). These mandates have however expanded and an increasing number of organisations are formerly dedicated to relief have expanded other domains such as addressing root causes, capacity and systems building.

While humanitarian assistance is based on the guiding principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality, development assistance is based on cooperation with national government and state officials. It is usually willing to take sides and work towards specific political goals. Ultimately the difference comes down to the degree in which they are willing to work with the state. Humanitarianism carry a hesitance to work with the state based on the principles of neutrality and independence in contrast with development transformative agenda that necessitate state cooperation to various degrees (Koddenbrock & Büttner, 2009:123). Bridging these two warrants the question whether humanitarian organisations are willing to compromise the principles of neutrality and independence for sustainable results (Audet, 2015:114, Koddenbrock & Büttner 2009:121). Joanna Macrae (2012:9) however argues that working with state institutions does not mean the need to abandon the humanitarian principles but to take a pragmatic, contexts specific decisions in the interest of the most vulnerable.

Figure 5 below shows a diagram where humanitarian and development organisations are on two opposites sides of the diagram with state avoidance on one side and state partnership on the other. The programs implemented are also inherently different and places humanitarian and development agencies on two different ends. However, partly due to the increased humanitarian caseload, there are humanitarian organisations willing to engage with states and aim to address the root causes of crisis, organisations that Barnett (2011) would classify as alchemist humanitarians, and that are moving increasingly towards state building and state partnership in the diagram. By the same token, there are development organisations that are increasingly recognising the need to incorporate resilience in their programs so that people affected by crisis- whether it be man-made or “natural” have better coping strategies. These trends are pulling the humanitarian and developments sectors closer towards the middle of the diagram.
3.2.1 How is the institutional gap observable?
The institutional gap boils down to two things. One is how humanitarian practitioners work with the humanitarian principles and how willing they are to be pragmatic or even compromise these. The other is the willingness of development practitioners to take on issues that are traditionally connected to the humanitarian sector and to have an emergency mind-set in their development activities. The following interview questions aimed at humanitarian and development practitioners respectively were aimed at identifying the institutional gap in their organisation:
How do you balance the neutrality principle with the need to work with national and local authorities in humanitarian settings?

How do you incorporate contingency planning in your development programs?

3.3 The Funding Gap

One thing that NGOs working in the humanitarian and development field have in common is that they are dependent on others for their resources. However, funding for humanitarian and development assistance usually comes from different budget lines in donor countries, with distinct rationales. The differing mandates come to play in this gap as well in that humanitarian funding is based on the rationale of saving lives in crisis and need. Development funding on the other hand, is based on donor interest as well as needs and the fact that a country has received humanitarian assistance does not mean that it will later receive development assistance (Suhrke and Ofstad, 2003:14). With different historical backgrounds the humanitarian and development have developed in to two different assistance systems. This divide has also caused many donors to develop separate mechanisms and institutions for providing and administrating these types of assistance (Steets, 2011: 6). The fragmentation between the two sectors is therefore also present in the donor systems. The lack of links between the different forms of assistance diminish the opportunities for longer-term orientation in humanitarian assistance, create operational problems and development actors are not sufficiently aware of emergency-related aspects of their work (Steets, 2011:35-36).

Evidence shows that what is called ”recovery” activities are more difficult to finance because there is reluctance in public institutions to fund “grey areas”. One reason can be that these activities do not meet the needs of neither humanitarian or development criteria. Another reason can be that public funds are under scrutiny of budget committees and audit institutions where overlap and duplications should be avoided (Steets, 2011:24). Similarly, funding can be difficult to secure for fragile states, which can be a product of donor fatigue.

In a result-driven donor community result indicators give preference to linear variables because it easily fits in with the result frameworks and are easy to communicate to policy-makers and the public (Christoplos, 2014:97). Monitoring and evaluation systems are not designed to respond to the complexities that need to be addressed through collaboration.
between humanitarian and development actors, such as risk, vulnerability and resilience. Lack of flexibility in funding arrangements is of concern, there have been efforts in longer-term funding options, strategic partnerships and pooling resources are attempted ways to make funding more flexible (Steets, 2011: 27-32). In a report from Sida to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on how to build capacity and build resilience against disasters they argue that this needs to be done through better interplay between humanitarian and development aid and that this is partly done by supporting organisations that work with both humanitarian and long-term development work (Sida, 2016), leading one to suspect that they assume that because an organisation work with both, there interplay as such comes naturally. However, this may be oversimplifying the power donors have over the recipients unless the different budget lines also provide incentives and flexibility for such collaboration.

Figure 6: Funding gap

Source: Author

Note: Figure 6 illustrates how donors have different budget lines, with different departments allocation the respective funding. These mechanisms have become so rigid that issues such as recovery, DRR and fragile states, end up in between in some kind of grey zone, it is not purely development and it is not purely humanitarian and as such funding for these is very difficult to secure.
3.3.1 How is the funding gap observable?
The funding gap has different aspects. One is the lack of funding for activities that do not naturally fall under humanitarian or development programs. Lack of links between the different forms of aid and the level of flexibility in funding arrangements are also indicators of a funding gap, a rigid donor system is less likely to create systems that enhance opportunities to bridge between humanitarian and development aid. The answers to the following interview questions could identify such a gap:

*To what extent would you say funding mechanisms support good links between humanitarian and development?*

4. Research Design

Having explained what I aim to accomplish with this thesis and why it is interesting, this chapter will address how I will accomplish this.

4.1 Research method

This is a qualitative comparative study based on nine semi-structured interviews conducted with practitioners in the humanitarian and development field. The main element of comparison is between humanitarian and development practitioners but there is also an added value in comparing the response between the different organisations. It is contextual research in that it aims to describe and display the tensions between relief and development fields as experienced by the practitioners by describing the meaning they ascribe to the concepts and practises in these fields (Ritchie and Ormston, 2014:31). The thesis takes an interpretivist epistemological orientation, which means that knowledge is derived from exploring and understanding the social world of the people being studied. My focus on the participant’s meanings and understandings serve as the basis for the construction of my meanings as a researcher (Ormston et al. 2014:12).

4.2 Thematic analysis

The material has been analysed through Thematic Analysis, which is a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns or themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006:76) and it
involves searching across a data set to find repeated patterns of meaning. It is an appropriate method because it is a perspective that assumes that the data is more or less accurate and truthful depiction of reality (Sandelowski, 2010:80), meaning that I can find out actual behaviours and attitudes among the participating practitioners. The aim of the study is to describe a dynamic through ideas, thoughts, feelings and attitudes and thematic analysis will not only help sort these into different themes for further analysis but also interpret various aspects of the research (Braun and Clarke, 2006:79). This means that I can both analyse specifically what practitioners are saying and what they are saying in combination with the context they are in (Joffe & Yardley, 2004 referred to in Vaimoradi et al., 2013:401). From an interpretivist epistemological approach I do not seek to focus on the individual psychologies of the participants, but rather theorise the sociocultural context and structural conditions that are cause the participants to have their attitudes and understandings (Braun and Clarke, 2010:85).

I identified the theoretical approach and formulated the research questions prior to conducting the interviews making this primarily a deductive study as the theoretical analysis driven by the analytical aspects of the three identified gaps between humanitarian and development assistance. Having said that, even though the theoretical framework was identified prior to the interviews and analysis were conducted, it did not mean that I had to stay within this framework (Sandelowski, 2010:80).

After the interviews had been conducted they were transcribed and read through, allowing me to familiarise myself additionally with the data, which is an important phase of the thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke 2006:87). The next phase was to generate initial codes across all the interviews. The codes were held very basic and were selected on the basis that their features were of interest in the analysis. The next phase was thereafter to collect the codes under the respective themes. I colour coded the codes according to how they fitted with the three themes, or some other emerging theme. Issues concerning temporal matters were coded in blue, institutional in green and funding issues were color-coded in pink. As risks became an emerging theme it was marked with red while capacity building was coded in yellow. It is important to note that prevalence is not only the number of times something is repeated, but can also be themes that that capture something in relation to the overall research question (Braun and Clarke, 2006:82). There cannot therefore be any rigid rules as to what is a pattern or theme but flexibility was paramount in order to detect the already determined themes but
also be receptive for other themes to emerge. Once this analysis was conducted the process of producing the result and discussion commenced, guided by the different themes.

4.3 Selection of cases

The data is a collection of nine semi-structured individual interviews, and one additional explorative interview, with mid-level employees from five different NGOs in Sweden. These are Save the Children, the Swedish Church, Swedish Mission Council (SMC), Plan International and the Swedish Red Cross (SRC). All of these are major actors in both the relief and development field. The organisations were selected by looking at Sida’s website for a list of their strategic partners in the CIVSAM and Humanitarian departments respectively. The explorative interview was held with Medicins Sans Frontieres (MSF) as many of the participants referred risks that MSF had identified. The five organisations selected for the study were all the organisations that were on both the CIVSAM and Humanitarian lists for strategic partners. In order to ensure that this list was accurate I contacted Sida to have the list confirmed, which it was. Even though they have the common denominator of being strategic partners to both the Humanitarian and CIVSAM departments, they vary in their size, approach and missions (child focus, psycho-social support, emergency and so on). This is called purposive sampling and it has the aim of representing the key constituencies of relevance to the subject and to ensure enough diversity (Ritchie et al. 2014:113). The choice of using organisations that were both strategic partners with CIVSAM and Humanitarian departments at Sida was both a way of limiting the scope of the research but also a strategic choice in that all organisations close collaboration with Sida may be a factor that influence their behaviours as well as may have a power to influence Sida.

Red cross differ from the other organisations in the study in that they have a clear emergency focus. They speak of long-term chronic emergencies and short-term rapid response and as

---

2 Through CIVSAM Sida provides support to actors in the civil society with the goal to fight poverty, contribute to democratic development and increase respect for human rights through a pluralistic society in development contexts (Utrikes Departementet, 2016). Strategic partners to the humanitarian department at Sida can apply funding for protracted crisis on a yearly basis. For sudden crises Sida has a mechanisms called Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM), which strategic partners can apply for when a crisis occurs and can have the funding within 24 hours (Sida, 2015).
such do not have a division of development and humanitarian sections. I therefore only interviewed one person from the Red Cross.

4.4 The Interviews
The interviews were an interaction between the participant and me as a researcher and this shaped the form and features of the generated data (Yeo et al. 2014: 180), and as such I need to demonstrate strong validity and reliability. The form of the interviews was semi structured. With the use of an interview guide (See appendix A) I was able to steer the discussion, when needed, but was able to build on themes addressed by the participant. The interviews were held in either Swedish or English depending on the preference of the participant and lasted between 40 minutes to an hour. Most of the interviews were conducted in the organisation’s offices in Stockholm or Uppsala, two interviews were held via Skype.

4.5 Ethical considerations
The participation was based on informed consent at all stages of the research. The participants were informed of the purpose of the study as a part of a master’s thesis at Umeå University at the onset and prior to each interview this was repeated and it was emphasised that they could opt out to take part or answering certain questions. The participants were chosen on the basis of familiarity with the themes, availability and position in their respective organisations. Qualitative research raises particular issues about confidentiality and anonymity. The combination of a small sample size and potential relationships between employees guided the decision to withhold the names of the participants, rather than any apparent risk that sensitive themes would emerge (Webster, Lewis & Brown, 2014:85). They were informed at the onset that in terms of confidentiality, their names would not be published but that organisation and sector of work would be explicit in the report.

Another ethical consideration is the fact that a majority of the interviews were conducted in Swedish, while the thesis is written in English. Language is a way to express meaning but can also influence how meaning is constructed (van Nes et al., 2010:314). Even though I have several years of experience of English as my professional language and have lived in English speaking countries, my translation of expressions risked loss of those meanings because it involved the interpretation of the translator, in this case me as a researcher. In the interviews that were conducted in Swedish there were no language difference in the process of data
gathering, transcription and initial analysis, which meant that it stayed close to the meanings. During the subsequent analysis and production of the report however, translation was necessary and it was important for me to keep close representation of the meanings expressed in Swedish when translated to English (for translation of the quotes, see Appendix B). This was done by checking my interpretations by going back to the codes and preliminary findings in the source language as well as by using fluid descriptions of meanings in the translation (van Nes et al., 2010:315). Having acknowledged this, it is important to point out that in the field of international aid, many of the key terms are in fact English even in Swedish offices and the usage of these terms made it easier to translate the meanings expressed by the participants.

4.6 Limitation
The central limitation to this study is that it only takes the perspective of Head Quarters and not at the field level, which is a conscious choice. Interviews were conducted in the Stockholm and Uppsala and even though the participants may have previous field experience, they were based at the head quarters for the interviews. While it would have been interesting to have a broader reach in the interviews such as interviewing and compare responses of practitioners in management levels, mid-level HQ personnel and field staff, or even donor and recipient responses, there is a temporal limit as to what can be done in a master thesis and the choice to take the head quarter level allows for a more focused result.

Another limitation that should be mentioned is the fact that although I have identified what I deem the most important gaps, there may be other gaps that could have an impact on the possibility to link the humanitarian and development action. Having said that, being open for emerging themes in the interviews allows for such gaps to surface in the discussions.

5. Results
Most participants agreed on the need to find ways to bridge humanitarian and development action better in order to provide better and more sustainable support. One specifically expressed that the bridge between humanitarian and development is created when humanitarian efforts open up for development components and when the development side opens up for a humanitarian component (Swedish Red Cross). One practitioner was apprehensive however, while recognising the need for better links between the two types of
efforts the person was worried about the potential risk of blurring the lines between what is humanitarian and what is development, which can place humanitarian actors in danger, and can affect the quality of the provision of aid (Humanitarian practitioner, Save the Children).

5.1 Organisations

5.1.1 Save the Children

Save the Children was founded 1919 in England by Eglantyne Jebb. Later, the same year Save the Children Sweden was founded as a sister organisation and Save the Children organisations around the world have since then cooperated in different operations (Rädda Barnen, n.d.). Save the Children in Sweden comes from a long history of development programing with a shorter history of humanitarian programing, the participant from the humanitarian side at Save the Children expressed that they have a humanitarian sector because Sida does (Humanitarian practitioner, Save the Children). The worldwide Save the Children Association is one of the largest NGO for children’s rights in the world with the coordinating body Save the Children International (SCI). The aim of the organisation is based on the Convention on the Rights of the Child summarised in three goals 1. That children should not be exposed to discrimination, exploitation, violence or other kinds of abuse. 2. That children can make their voice heard and influence their own situation and 3. That children are afforded a safe and healthy childhood and a learning that ensures self-reliance and relevant knowledge (Rädda Barnen, 2016). The biggest proceeds come from individual donors giving individual amounts or donating on a monthly basis. Sida funds amounted to 416.7 million SEK in 2015, which is 33.1 % of SCS total revenue. The EU provided 82.3 million SEK and the UN 170.5 million SEK (Rädda Barnen, 2016a: 28). 40% of the total program costs in 2015 went to humanitarian projects (Rädda Barnen, 2016a: 32).

5.1.2 Swedish Church

The Swedish Church’s International Work is founded on the belief that God takes a stand for the silenced or living in vulnerable situation. They have six main areas of focus: 1. Faith and learning; 2. Peace and reconciliation; 3. Sustainable supply; 4. Gender Rights and equality, 5. Sexual and reproductive health and rights; 6. Democratic space (Svenska Kyrkan, 2017). The Swedish Church’s International Work is a part of ACT-alliance (Action by Churches Together), which consists of over 143 faith-based aid organisations across the world. Their development work aims to work with the underlying factors to injustice and poverty by
strengthening civil society actors in 40 different countries (Svenska Kyrkan, 2016:14). Their humanitarian work is mostly coordinated through the ACT-alliance and in cooperation with other organisations. The Swedish Church’s humanitarian work focuses on the psychosocial support in emergencies. The international department in the Church Office has about 80 employees and has a group of employees that can be deployed on short notice. About ten employees are deployed in one year working primarily with psychosocial support in humanitarian contexts.

5.1.3 Swedish Mission Council
The Swedish Mission Council is an ecumenical organisation. The member organisations are churches and popular movements that work towards human rights, democracy, peace and justice and fighting poverty. The Christian faith is a driving factor in the work and is expressed in the faith that every individual has the inherent power to change (Swedish Mission Council [SMC], 2016). The strategy for 2017-2021 addresses the need to be a voice for both the long term and relief efforts but also the importance to work towards strengthening the resilience against disasters. The Swedish Mission Council does not have direct implementation in other nations but forwards the funds received from Sida to different member organisations. SMR forwarded during 2015 about 124 million SEK to 16 different member organisations involved in 63 different programs and projects (SMC 2015:10). The Swedish Mission Council also forward funds to member organisations that are humanitarian actors. During 2015 Sida Humanitarian funding was forwarded to eight long-term humanitarian projects and four emergency projects. 89% of the total revenues for 2015 came from Sida and about 40.4 million SEK went to humanitarian projects (SMC, 2015:37). The Swedish Mission Council as an organisation has a longer history of receiving development aid from Sida than humanitarian aid (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Mission Council).

5.1.4 Plan International Sweden
Plan International is a global organisation that was created in 1937 as a response to the suffering of children during the Spanish Civil war. The Swedish office opened in the 1990’s and is part of the worldwide Plan International (Plan International, n.d). Plan has a framework agreement with Sida under the CIVSAM framework that is running between April 2015 and January 2018 with a total budget of 498.5 million SEK. Their development programs include 19 countries and some regional initiatives with the overarching aim, through cooperation with local organisations, support and strengthen children’s rights, through for example participation, child protection and sexual and reproductive rights for
youth (Plan International, 2016). During 2016 Plan provided humanitarian for about 45 million SEK in funding from Sida. Plan’s humanitarian efforts are also focused on child rights and are both reactionary and preventive. The Sida funds have been used for education, child protection, water and sanitation in refugee crises and natural disasters (Plan International, 2016). 49% of Plan International Sweden’s total revenues come from public funding that come with donor requirements. Similar to Save the Children and the Swedish Mission Council, Plan has a longer history of development programming while their humanitarian programming is still fairly new (Humanitarian practitioner, Plan International).

5.1.5 Swedish Red Cross

The Swedish Red Cross organised in 1865, is the largest humanitarian volunteer organisation in Sweden (Swedish Red Cross [SRC], n.d) and is part of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The Red Cross has a clear humanitarian focus with strong commitment to the humanitarian principles and provides support in many different disaster stricken areas around the world. In addition to these and the domestic programs Swedish Red Cross also has a deeper cooperation with 13 partner countries with the goal of strengthening the resilience and ability to recover for people in these areas so that they are better prepared for the future (SRC, 2015:10). In 2015 30% of their operating income were grants from Sida amounting 212 million SEK (SRC, 2015:12). The Swedish Red Cross is a strategic partner with Sida but does not currently receive direct funding through the Sida CIVSAM frame agreement like the other participating organisations in the study. They do however receive development funding from Sida through the organisation Forum Syd. Even though the Red Cross has a clear humanitarian approach, many of their programs can classically be deemed development programs.

5.2 Temporal gap

Table 1: Temporal gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Save the Children</th>
<th>Swedish Church</th>
<th>Swedish Mission Council</th>
<th>Plan International</th>
<th>Swedish Red Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no coordination in HQ and changes need to be made.</td>
<td>No system of coordination</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>Coordination is done on country level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Humanitarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any existing coordination is inadequate and needs to improve</th>
<th>No formal system for coordination, it is dependent on individual drive</th>
<th>Coordination is weak because work is hectic and project-based</th>
<th>No formal coordination in HQ</th>
<th>Exit strategies are weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes in HQ no on country-level</td>
<td>Yes-to a degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table summarises the respective answers to the following question: In a situation where humanitarian efforts are transitioned into development efforts, or when development efforts need to transition to humanitarian efforts, how is that transition coordinated at the HQ?

5.2.1 Development practitioners

“It is important to bridge in order to pick up the work that has already been done in the humanitarian and move it forward to the long-term”

(Development practitioner, Swedish Church)

The people interviewed that worked with the development side of aid spoke of the importance to bridge in order to pick up on the work that has already been done in the humanitarian phase to move it forward to the long-term and to build something that does not fall apart once the organisations leave, but has local ownership. A situation may be acute but it will then transition in to something else, like development needs, suggesting a clear transitional perspective between humanitarian and development efforts.

None of the organisations could give any example of any coordination between the end of a humanitarian effort and the start of development programs. One practitioner explained that the responsibility to coordinate such a transition lies on the country offices and not in the offices where the funding originates (Development practitioner, Plan International). Another participants explained that one of the reasons for this is that calls for proposals need swift action and seldom leaves room for such collaboration or consideration. It was similarly explained the lack of coordination between development and humanitarian sectors as a result of the constant financial constraint necessitating a focus on delivering on the goals of the projects, leaving little room to properly consider the links with DRR for instance, unless there is a direct imminent risk (Development practitioner, Swedish Church). Because of the lack of formal or structural incentives for collaboration, much of the possibility to bridge the temporal gap between the humanitarian and development sectors lie in the creativity,
flexibility and drive among the individual practitioners and the driving forces within the organisation. Many practitioners expressed frustration that not enough is being done and that it is taking so long for developing programs or initiatives to bridge between the sectors.

One practitioner pointed out that humanitarian action comes in different phases, there is the emergency phase but there are also the protracted crises where the need to link development aspects to the humanitarian action is the most important. Development actors as well as private actors should be included earlier in such situations so that there can be parallel efforts that can transition to the national systems (Development Practitioner, Save the Children). Another practitioner gave the example of Uganda and explained that large flows of refugees from South Sudan has caused them to work with both humanitarian and development efforts in Uganda and for that work to be more successful there needs to be more collaboration between the different sections (Development practitioner, Swedish Church). If there is no collaboration between humanitarian and development actors two parallel systems are instead created which is not conducive in the efforts to achieve sustainable development. These experiences of the need for cross-sectorial collaboration in protracted crisis, such as the case of large flows of refugees from South Sudan coming to Uganda, are examples of what was illustrated in figures 3 and 4 in section 3.1. Figure 3 illustrated the creation of parallel systems when there is no collaboration and figure 4 illustrated that better results should be achieved through collaboration.

Save the Children had an experience of how the development work was disrupted by a humanitarian crisis in their programs in the Philippines. The Philippines was one of the large program countries for Save the Children at the time when the typhoon Haiyan hit the country in 2013 but the catastrophic effects forced the office and development work to close down for several months. This served as a wake-up call to the office in Sweden to as what can happen in the field and even though if the Sweden office unpreparedness might not have catastrophic consequences, it is important, in order to support the field work, to be prepared in how to act with donors (Development Practitioner, Save the Children). This experience by Save the Children is an example of the problems that were illustrated in figure 1 in section 3.1 in that the development programs were disrupted by crisis and forced these to be put on hold while the humanitarian response was taking place.
One way that there could be a connection between humanitarian and development is through strengthening regional and country offices in contingency planning. All organisations must do a risk analysis for their programs and most often have mitigation plans. This should be developed to fully-fledged contingency plans that can serve as a road map between development and humanitarian efforts. Save the Children made it a goal to strengthen this in vulnerable areas but found that there is a challenge in that different contexts require different competencies and as such contingency planning needs to be accompanied by capacity building, the local staff needs to be confident that they can respond in an emergency (Development practitioner, Save the Children).

5.2.2 Humanitarian practitioners

“Humanitarian action may be acute, but the person’s life, which it affects, is always long-term” (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church)

The transition between humanitarian and development action from the humanitarian side was spoken of in terms of exit strategies. Exit strategies often have a connection with development issues, practices, methodology or cooperation even though they do not explicitly have the word development in them. However, even though there is always an aim to follow through with these exit strategies, these aims are not often met. The Swedish Red Cross expressed that there is a weakness in that they do not have clear exits and that if you were to look around in the world at Red Cross activities you would find projects that would be better suited for another actor (Swedish Red Cross). Save the Children similarly expressed that there is always an aim to have exit strategies but that the problem is that these often tend to be generic with little adaptation to the specific contexts (Humanitarian practitioner, Save the Children). Exit strategies do not however necessarily mean handing over to the development side of the same organisation. Sometimes there are mechanisms in the area that can take over once the response is over. Non-implementing organisations aim to strengthen the capacity with people in the area where they implement, it is then instead important to document methods that have been used in the humanitarian efforts that may also be relevant to development efforts (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church).
Many humanitarian practitioners pointed to the weakness of coordination in the transitions between humanitarian and development. One of the reasons for this, which was touched upon by some development practitioners as well, is the fact that many of the programs are funded on project basis, which makes them driven that way rather than ideologically driven. This increases the difficulty in bridging humanitarian programs with development programs. One practitioner expressed concern that the bridging that is being done now is done on an ad hoc basis with little logic behind it and may thus not created the desired results (Humanitarian Practitioner, Swedish Mission Council). Because of a lack of formal structure for coordination between the sectors practitioners pointed to the importance of individual drive for coordination and informal forms of collaboration in terms of planning and discussing on breaks, when someone is travelling somewhere and so on (Humanitarian practitioners Plan International, Swedish Church and Swedish Mission Council). There is perhaps a need to formalise what has previously been done informally so that processes may be strengthened and thus make it easier to accomplish.

While donors speak of humanitarian action as the short-term, the reality of protracted crisis observable in refugee camps for instance suggests that such thinking is out-dated and International Humanitarian Law does not make any time distinction. However, as soon as the most basic needs have been satisfied the long-term aspects need to be considered, as one practitioner expressed it:

“There are some contexts, that are said to be so acute that you cannot start to speak about building a couple of schools, but in two weeks you will start speaking about it. The time-span between the acute and when you need to start thinking about the long-term is surprisingly short” (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church)

The need for collaboration between humanitarian and development action exists in both the transition between the two as well as in crisis that goes beyond the humanitarian imperative of saving lives and alleviating suffering. The transition phase is very fragile because the smallest shock to the system would send it back to a crisis phase, but there is no funding for the transition phase, because it is not interesting. So this is where the cooperation between humanitarian and development becomes important, to bridge this grey-zone, to bridge programs that link the methods by working in the same geographical areas. It was expressed
that it is about human dignity to create security and self-esteem and faith that things will be ok, and then build capacity (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church).

One participant explained when development programs were disrupted by crisis most often they were put on hold for the situation to allow a continuation, similar to the example of Save the Children in the Haiyan response, and that many organisations are bad at rethinking what they can do because they are stuck in their methods (Humanitarian Practitioner, Swedish Mission Council). There needs to be better preparedness in development aid for humanitarian crises so that investments do not go to waste. There should also be a plan how to return or transition to development programs. In the post emergency efforts it is important to retain the lessons learned whether they are positive or negative. One participant suggested that emergency preparedness plans (EPP), also called contingency plans, should be based on this, but expressed that often the problem is that the response personnel leave or there is no budget to uphold the EPP. The will and thoughts may be there but we are not structured to uphold, that is why it is important that the personnel in the head quarters should provide this support as they have the luxury to have broader perspective. (Humanitarian Practitioner, Save the Children).

5.3 Institutional gap

Table 2: Institutional gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Save the Children</th>
<th>Swedish Church</th>
<th>Swedish Mission council</th>
<th>Plan International</th>
<th>Swedish Red Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency plans</td>
<td>Contingency plans are incorporated in vulnerable areas Capacity building is needed.</td>
<td>There are risk analysis and mitigation strategies. These need to be strengthened</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>There are risk &amp; vulnerability analysis for country programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>Neutrality should be based on the needs of the people and can be balanced by their informed consent</td>
<td>Principles can be applicable in both humanitarian and development contexts</td>
<td>They take a rights-based approach, which is not very different from humanity. Principles. Pragmatism is needed</td>
<td>Negotiations and discussions, but working long-term in a country will need a link to the system somehow.</td>
<td>A constant balance needs to be struck and a dialogue is always needed. Upholding the principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional gap observable?
Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No No

The table summarises the respective answers to the following questions:

Development: How do you incorporate contingency planning in your development programs?
Humanitarian: How do you balance the neutrality principle with the need to work with national and local authorities in humanitarian settings? Development practitioner's responses point to an institutional gap while humanitarian practitioners responses point to that the humanitarian principles is in reality not the problem.

5.3.1 Development practitioners

“The gap is created from a tradition of this division, which is a tendency found throughout the aid industry and there is a lack of a holistic view”

(Development practitioner, Swedish Mission Council)

In their different definitions of what is respectively humanitarian and development it was clear that their definition of what humanitarian is corresponded with what Barnett (2011) would define as emergency humanitarianism-saving lives and alleviate suffering, with some additional aspects of ensuring human dignity through adherence to international law. Development on the other hand was defined as a mutual process of strengthening states that have been affected by crisis or conflict. However, when discussing different programs and projects such definitions were not always applicable. One practitioner, when addressing the difference between humanitarian and development work, explained it as a scale where different humanitarian work tends to move towards development work and the other way around, giving the example of DRR as being a project that could have been programmed from both the humanitarian and development section (Development practitioner, Plan International). This is in a way an example of what was illustrated in figure 5 in section 3.2. Even though that figure is a two dimensional description of the difference between humanitarian and development action it can depict what this participant described as a scale where different humanitarian work are placed on different distances from what would be classically called development work and vice versa. This description suggests that there are no clear-cut rules as to what is humanitarian and development and that there is in fact a grey-
zone. It was also expressed that humanitarian programs require specific capacity and technical expertise in that these planning and execution is done in a quicker pace in more complex contexts.

When asked about the incompatibility between the humanitarian principles and state building the Save the Children practitioner responded that there really is no conflict in humanitarian principles for development actors. The Red Cross was given as an example. They are governed by the humanitarian principles but they do a lot of long-term work, especially in terms of the work the Red Cross national societies do, and can easily be deemed development work. They work very closely with the state while maintaining their neutrality. Save the Children has the same advisory role with the state whether it is humanitarian or development context (Development practitioner, Save the Children). The Swedish Mission Council practitioner explained that their development work follows the principles of non-discrimination, transparency, participation and responsibility (Development practitioner, Swedish Mission Council). These are all principles part of the Core Humanitarian standard; principles signatory humanitarian organisations adhere to while at the same time adhering to the humanitarian principles of neutrality, impartiality, humanity and independence (CHS Alliance et al., 2014). This suggests that development work really is not in conflict with the humanitarian principles; it all depends on how the actors approach these principles in relation to the state and the affected population.

The development practitioner from Save the Children argued that what is needed is a better understanding of what a bridge is about and to demystify the concept for everyone, because when there is a better understanding, the cooperation will come naturally. People need to understand that there is an intervention cycle that starts with preparedness and ends in reconstruction with each component connected to the next and that there is expertise in the organisation throughout the whole cycle. Leadership also needs to drive the efforts and spread clarity of what the organisation aims to achieve (Development practitioner, Save the Children).

Plan, Save the Children and the Swedish Mission Council all have a long history of development programming and the humanitarian programming has not been part of these organisations until fairly recently. This has meant that their development and humanitarian work has grown from different priorities and needs that have caused silos to be created within
the organisation. Another part is that at least some of them are donor driven which makes the organisation move in the same direction as the donors. Sida for instance has the structure of humanitarian and development as two different departments.

Whether the institutional differences causes difficulties in collaboration or not, one suggestion of small steps that can be taken to facilitate a bridge was to look at methods that could work in both types of programs. The Swedish Church is working on a identifying these methods for their program revisions. For instance, they have a focus on psychosocial support in humanitarian responses, which is a program that can be appropriate for long-term development programs as well. By focusing on methods they aim to work towards a bridge by utilising the same methods in their respective programs and see that as a first step towards a better bridge (Development practitioner, Swedish Church).

5.3.2 Humanitarian practitioners

“The split between humanitarian and development is not real; it is created by systems and not by the people in need of support” (Humanitarian Practitioner, Plan International)

The definitions to what is humanitarian and what is development corresponded to a large degree with what the development practitioner’s definitions. However, many of the humanitarian practitioners went deeper in describing the role of humanitarian action and the need for a bridge between that and long-term development efforts. The participant from the Swedish Church explained that there are two types of humanitarian work, again similar to Barnett’s (2011) two distinct humanitarianisms. One is the acute action of saving lives and alleviating suffering and the other is a more long-term response in humanitarian contexts, or contexts where a small shock to the system causes individuals to fall back to an acute condition. Long-term development work, according to this participant, exists in places where there is a strong structural ground that the context is of the nature where a shock to the system does not pull individuals in to a crisis condition, but that these shocks can be handled by the system (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church).
Several humanitarian practitioners participating drew the analogy of humanitarian work as the fire brigade with the charge to respond in emergency. One went on an explained that it is not the charge of a fireman to build a fireproof house, but that is the responsibility of a fire engineer. The risk with moving toward development is that the sight of the humanitarian imperative of saving lives and alleviating suffering is lost; that instead of sending a fireman to the fire, you send a fire engineer. But you have to put out the fire first. The discussion about streamlining humanitarian aid because of the need to put out the same fires in the same place is not an issue to humanitarians - it is their purpose (Humanitarian practitioner, Save the Children).

When addressing the possible contradiction between the humanitarian and working towards building systems in cooperation with the state many participants expressed the constant balance that need to be struck with the state in order to uphold these principles, but that this does not in reality stand in the way of linking humanitarian and development efforts. The participant from the Red Cross unsurprisingly explained that they always need permission from the state when providing support, and sometimes the state can be the belligerent part. Cooperation with the authorities does not mean that you jeopardise the humanitarian principles, it depends on what deal you strike and there will always be grey zones and it is a constant balancing needed in the humanitarian aid. This does not become more difficult because the work tends to need more of a development nature but what is important is to have the needs of the population as the starting point (Swedish Red Cross). The problem seems to come when things are done without mindfulness of the principles. There is a risk of diminishing the humanitarian principles when there is a weak mindfulness of how organisations aim to bridge their humanitarian and development efforts, when it is done ad hoc and not systematically and relevant to the specific contexts (Humanitarian Practitioner, Swedish Mission Council).

Another practitioner suggested that what is needed is to sit down and on a global level to talk about how to translate the humanitarian principles in development contexts. A dialogue about how the humanitarian principles work in a development context may surprise how many of them are applicable and how many of them actually already are applied (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church). Similarly did a humanitarian practitioner from Plan express that if you bring people working only on humanitarian and development respectively together
then they will soon realise that that it would function very well (Humanitarian practitioner, Plan International).

The division of humanitarian and development has caused the actors in each field to work in silos. It was pointed out that this is an unnatural division that does not mirror reality and the societies that receive aid are not structured after the logic of the allocation processes (Humanitarian Practitioner, Swedish Mission Council). Just like the funding streams have become too separate, which will be discussed in the next chapter, so too have organisations rigged these two sectors too separately. The creation of different systems makes it hard to communicate. There is an institutional, structural problem that also brings about a capacity problem. One practitioner expressed it well:

“If you have rigged a system to keep it separate then it is hard for a person working with development to understand the humanitarian enough to link to it in a meaningful way, and the other way around” (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church)

In order for a meaningful link between humanitarian and development action the processes need to collaborate. One practitioner expressed frustration however that even though the aid politics that the Swedish government claim to drive is to make different processes to collaborate, their internal processes do not collaborate, affecting civil society organisation’s ability to access funding. The example was given of the Sida country frames that work differently in different embassies without open application times or procedures (Swedish Red Cross).

All practitioners agreed that to get away from the silo-thinking and achieve any type of link between humanitarian and development requires political will, on different levels, on governments, donors, organisation’s management teams, as well as on individual practitioners. One participant suggested that high-level leadership need to decide that this is important and allocate responsibility to specific people with allocated working hours to work on this. Employees can do lobbying and encourage change in a workplace but there is a need for leadership that believes in, and allocate resources to it (Humanitarian Practitioner, Swedish Mission Council). Another expressed that it takes a long time before there is a turn-
over, partly due to bureaucratic systems and to move away from this someone needs to dare think in a new way, dare to take decisions that will not be comfortable to everyone. Things are largely moving in the right direction but the systems do not collaborate and that has consequences (Swedish Red Cross). A third participants however pointed out that in all this we must not forget what the aim is, we want to save lives and alleviate suffering and give people a dignified existence where they are and where they are heading. Sometimes the works gets muddled up in systems and funding structures, but systems and funding streams are enablers or methods to reach that aim, not the aim itself (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church).

5.4 Funding gap

Table 3: Funding gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Save the Children</th>
<th>Swedish Church</th>
<th>Swedish Mission Council</th>
<th>Plan International</th>
<th>Swedish Red Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Grants-driven and move in the direction of the donors</td>
<td>There is no funding for efforts to link specifically</td>
<td>Things have improved. In particular CIVSAM in relation to resilience and DRR</td>
<td>There is a constant lack of funding so the focus is to deliver on the specific goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>The fact that there is a separate humanitarian section at SCS is a result of the structure at Sida</td>
<td>There is great encouragement to link, but funding streams and structures does not allow it.</td>
<td>There are some good efforts on the dev. Side but many things fall in between</td>
<td>There have been increased limitations. Might be a transition period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding gap observable?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table summarises the respective answers to the following question:
To what extent would you say funding mechanisms support good links between humanitarian and development?

5.4.1 Development practitioners

“There is too much downpipe thinking within the aid industry… but the world can not easily be divided into two downpipes and what happens with
everything that falls in between, that does not naturally fall in each respective sector?” (Development practitioner, Swedish Mission Council)

It was clear that both humanitarian and development practitioners find the financial obstacle very important to overcome in order to achieve a meaningful link. The lack of funding for programs as well as the restriction from donor structures and rules makes it very hard, especially for donor driven organisations, to achieve effective links within their own organisation. Aid organisations operate in a field where there are constant funding gaps, in the sense that there is not enough money. In the efforts then to bridge intensifies the funding gap because in a way becomes an additional field in need of funding. One development practitioner explained that when they want to drive a program they scan for what is available to fund it but that there is no funding for programs that aim specifically to bridge the gap but it always boils down to the creativity and innovation of each individual practitioner to find ways to fund such projects (Development practitioner, Swedish Church). Similarly is the silo thinking between humanitarian and development reinforced by different funding mechanisms for these different types of programs and this thinking does not mirror reality. Because of the silo thinking in donor communities activities that could serve as ways of linking humanitarian and development action, such as DRR and recovery, but do not focus as strictly on saving lives and alleviating suffering, falls in between (Development practitioner, Swedish Mission Council).

Some development practitioners were optimistic in that they have seen a development for the better. Sida for instance has opened up the CIVSAM mechanism for activities that include DRR and resilience, and there seems to be a window of opportunity on that front in combination with mounting challenges of humanitarian needs in the world (Development practitioner Swedish Mission Council). What is needed from the donor community is more clarity on how they think around these issues and such a clarification could help their partners know how they can use the different funding mechanisms in their aim to have a holistic approach to the work they do. If the donor community want to see better links between humanitarian and development efforts, they can clarify and make incentives for such links. The system as it is now is dependent on the innovation, drive and flexibility of the individual staff of the organisations and is often constrained by the donor systems.
The different donor requirements and structures does not only affect the offices in the head quarters but perhaps even more so in the country offices, where they have to sit with a giant puzzle of different member’s and donor’s reporting requirements making it hard for them to combine or even bridge their efforts (Development practitioner, Save the Children). One practitioner suggested that an extra resource within the organisation in form a position of a person, that could work actively in supporting efforts to bridge, and that can have a holistic view of the programs, could be a way to achieve better links (Development practitioner, Swedish Church).

5.4.2 Humanitarian practitioner

“The world is changing, shouldn’t the tools change also?” (Humanitarian Practitioner, Plan, International)

While the development practitioners recognised the constraint they were in under the donor systems, the humanitarian practitioners expressed less optimism and more frustration over these constraints and many of the interviews were spent discussing the role of the donors in the efforts to link humanitarian and development efforts in great lengths.

Even though donors, and in particular Sida, are expressing that they want organisations to create bridges between the humanitarian and development work, donor rules and requirements are still very strict in what can be done under what funding mechanism and there are no specific funding mechanisms for efforts to bridge. One participant expressed that a lot of the work may lie with them as an organisation in that they need to formulate and start thinking differently and be proactive and challenge Sida that way (Humanitarian Practitioner, Swedish Mission Council). Another participant expressed that there is great encouragement from the donor community to work with the link between humanitarian and development but the donor’s funding streams and organisation do not allow for this development to be a reality. The conversation is going in the right direction, there is a will but it is time to start changing the structures. Each organisation can work on it internally but if they do not access the funding, then they cannot deliver (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church).
The problem lies in that different donors have different funding streams according to clear-cut humanitarian of saving lives and alleviating suffering and development based on stability where there can be long-term planning. However, between these two there are many countries, regions, or contexts where no funding is applicable. Some aspects of early recovery and DRR activities fits in to Sida’s humanitarian strategy, but many things still fall in between because of the narrow thinking of the donors (Swedish Red Cross; Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church).

The Red Cross practitioner expressed frustration over the fact that Sida is now investing in resilience and pushing that on the development side, by providing large financial volumes that are much larger on the development side that are de facto forcing humanitarian actors, that have identified what they can do successfully, in the areas that are governed by political instruments, which becomes very uncomfortable. One example was given of a resilience program in Bangladesh, which is an area prone to natural disasters and in need of continued support. However, Sida has now flagged that the Red Cross will not receive more humanitarian funding for Bangladesh, unless there is a natural disaster, because it is not one of their priority countries (Swedish Red Cross). This suggests that even though they have opened up their mechanisms for programs that include resilience, DRR and capacity strengthening, their allocation processes undermine those efforts.

The Plan practitioner also expressed concern that donors do not approve of all the items proposed by the organisation. They have seen for instance that the ECHO funding is shrinking and do no longer allow items such as DRR, which complicated the work towards a holistic approach to aid. However, this person expressed optimism in that this might be a transition phase and that the instruments will develop and new instruments might emerge but could not deny that the initial changes had intensified the already existing gaps (Humanitarian practitioner, Plan International). The participant from the Red Cross expressed similar concerns that Sida has increasingly questioned things in their Rapid Response Mechanisms (RRM) applications that were called workshops and trainings, saying that these are not direct life saving. These would be trainings that were directly connected with the project that are in the application because of codes in their internal budget systems, so they had to explain that very clearly. The practitioner expressed frustration over the fact that even though research shows that in order to provide good assistance there need to be thinking about recovery from the beginning assistance is provided, donor start to earmark away everything defined as some.
kind of early recovery, resilience, DRR because it is not directly life saving. This seems
counter productive to what Sida says they want to do (Swedish Red Cross). Many
organisations have the ability to fill funding for items that donors reject in applications with
other funding, but they cannot always match the volumes that the big donors can provide.

Donors need to remember that trust, accountability and transparency goes both ways and that
they need to let the organisation be who they are. Sida has chosen their strategic partners on
the basis that they are professional and experienced organisations and Sida can work with in
many different sort of crises around the world (Sida, 2014), suggesting an added value in the
diversity of organisations as well as acknowledging that these organisations are competent in
what they do. If Save the Children, for instance, says what needs to be done for children’s
rights to be ensured, then the donor needs to trust that Save the Children knows that.

Many of the humanitarian practitioners brought up the Grand Bargain, which is a package of
reform to humanitarian funding deal launched at the World Humanitarian Summit. It consists
of ten commitments that signatories undertake in order for more aid to reach more people
more effectively. One of the commitments is to enhance the engagement between
humanitarian and development actors and the Swedish government is one of the signatories
(Agenda for Humanity, 2016). This has instilled some hope in some of the participants that
perhaps things will change for the better and that if Sida adheres to these principles it will be
easier to bridge. One participant was however not as optimistic meaning that if donors start
harmonising between humanitarian and development actors, there is a risk that all these
organisations morph in to some kind of general aid organisations which in turn will mean that
all they can provide is a watered-down aid without the current specific specialisations and
loosing the diversity of organisations (Humanitarian practitioner, Save the Children).

5.5 Risks

One of the specific themes that became apparent during the interviews was that there were
potential risks with bridging humanitarian and development action. Many of the participants
brought up arguments made by other organisations, Doctors Without Borders/Medicins Sans
Frontieres (MSF) in particular, about these potential risks, which warrants some space to
discuss these here. Since MSF was mentioned specifically by many of the participants, I
contacted one practitioner in their Stockholm office and discussed these risk in an explorative
interview via Skype. In addition to the information from that call I was referred to different reports and articles on the subject produced by MSF or its staff.

5.5.1 Development practitioners

Few of the development practitioners could point at any risks with bridging humanitarian and development work and most participants argued that the benefits would outweigh any risks. There are constant risks in aid work in general and that this would not change those risks, one participant pointed to the power perspective and the risk of donor driven programs without local ownership (Development practitioner Swedish Mission Council). Another pointed to practical aspects such as bottlenecks for systems on the ground, giving the example of multiple different coordination mechanisms in one country (Development practitioner, Save the Children).

Another risk that was brought up was the fact that the industry is filled with cross-cutters, themes that need to be mainstreamed in all aspect of aid, such as gender, environmental impact and conflict sensitivity, and it is important that the efforts to bridge between humanitarian and development does not become just another cross-cutter because there is a saturation in what people are able to handle (Development practitioner, Plan, International).

The only risk however, that was brought up by both humanitarian and development practitioners was the risk that bridging would force humanitarian actors do development work and that development actors would be forced to do humanitarian work. While the two types of aid structures need to be better linked, it does not mean that they should become one and the same. One practitioner expressed that it is still important for organisations to be specialised but that regardless of what kind of organisation it is, there need to be an awareness of the long-term and willingness to work with other actors (Development practitioner, Save the Children).

5.5.2 Humanitarian practitioners

It was clear that humanitarian practitioners were much more aware of the potential risks connected with the goal of bridging humanitarian and development action than the development practitioners. As was explained in the beginning of this chapter one practitioner was particularly apprehensive about the bridging due to the potential risks. One of the risks of particular concern, which was also brought up by a development practitioner, was that by bridging all aid organisations would morph into the same type of organisation doing both
humanitarian and development work. This would risk that the aid provided would worsen because it would be watered down and actors will move from being distinct to generalist and indistinct with the risk of prolonging the system (Humanitarian practitioner, Save the Children).

Another risk was that development actors would begin operating in humanitarian contexts without the same technical expertise and without the same regard for the humanitarian principles, which would take up the humanitarian space and risk the quality of the aid provided (Swedish Red Cross; Humanitarian practitioner, Plan International). Even one of the development practitioners acknowledged that humanitarian programming requires specialised competence, partly due to the quick pace of work (Development practitioner, Plan). The worry then that non-specialised practitioners would take up humanitarian space is a reasonable concern.

A more practical risk is that there currently is limited money in the world for this kind of work, and if money was to be taken from the humanitarian funding to fund what is in the grey-zone or even development, there is a risk that fewer lives would be saved and lesser suffering would be alleviated (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church). The experience of the Red Cross loosing funding for their programs in Bangladesh is one example of how the donor’s priorities caused loss of funding in other areas. The concern lies in that a new approach or way of working will mean that something else will have to give.

5.5.3 Medicins Sans Frontieres view on risks
Even though they did not feel the same kind of apprehension, many of the participants brought up Doctors Without Borders (MSF) rather strong stance in the discussion around links between humanitarian and development action. Their apprehension to the changing of the system through linking humanitarian and development action lies on two levels. One is on a principled level, that states and donors are trying to manipulate humanitarian actors to serve political purposes (Olivier, 2014). Using the humanitarian access in the purpose of reaching political goals crosses a boundary that risks humanitarian legitimacy and it threatens to obscure the distinction between the two types of aid (Medicins Sans Frontieres [MSF], 2016:3). They argue that humanitarian action should remain separate from development approaches because of fundamentally different objectives and functions and arguing that humanitarian action does not aim to address root causes (MSF, 2016:2).
The other level of criticism to changing the system is on a systematic level. In the World Humanitarian Summit the focus was from delivering aid to ending needs. MSF argues that there are glaring failures in the current system in that the system first needs to improve its ability to save lives and alleviate suffering before it can talk about ending needs (MSF, 2016:2). The focus on ending needs through linking humanitarian and development action risks reducing the capacity of humanitarian actors to respond to emergency and risks that the system overlooks the basics. They argue that prevention will not take away the responsibility to respond and as such the system needs to improve its ability to save lives and alleviate suffering everywhere that it is needed before it should do anything else.

6. Discussion
This thesis aims to describe and analyse the dynamics between humanitarian and development sectors and how these dynamics affect the opportunity to collaborate to achieve sustainable results. In the following discussion I will answer the research questions set out in this thesis starting with the first one:

6.1 Research question 1
How do practitioners from NGOs in Sweden, working with both humanitarian and development assistance, understand the gaps between humanitarian and development assistance?

6.1.1 Temporal gap
The linear thinking is still a large part of the aid rhetoric and we might never move away from that thinking, as that is the way many people see reality. But seeing one type of action transition to the next is perhaps not negative. While humanitarian actors spoke of exit plans and development actors spoke of the need to pick up what had already been done, both development and humanitarian practitioners argued that coordination is crucial in the transitional phase. Exit plans need to feed in to the development work and development work need to have a better understanding of humanitarian needs. The transitional phase however is not just the end of a crisis when humanitarian actors leave and development actors step in or when humanitarians need to step in to a development context. There is also a type of
transition in a protracted crisis when the needs move from the acute of saving lives and alleviating suffering to more long-term needs such as education and livelihood and all types of transition need some kind of coordination. Contingency plans can serve as a road map for both people in the field and head quarters when development work needs to move to humanitarian work, however for these to be effective they need to be accompanied with budgetary resources as well as the relevant capacity building to keep the plans and the capacity in the office updated and relevant to the specific contexts.

Based on the responses by the participant it may be concluded that there are temporal gaps in the aid work that affects the quality of the assistance provided. There is a general awareness and drive of the need to link humanitarian and development by these practitioners, some with some apprehension because of potential risks, but nonetheless all spoke of the need to at least have better transitions between the two types of action. However, the responses by the participants of this study points to that the temporal gap is in reality more a product of the other two gaps. The difficulty in achieving smooth transition through collaborative coordination lies to a large degree in the institutional and financial constraints that both sectors operate under.

6.1.2 Institutional gap
While some scholars argued that the humanitarian principles and development programming were incompatible (Koddenbrock & Büttner, 2009) the participating humanitarian practitioners were more pragmatic and expressed that the humanitarian principles did not necessarily have to be compromised because of changes in how aid is delivered. There was a pragmatism and flexibility across all organisations and participants of the study that suggested that this is not the most pressing issue in order to link humanitarian and development work. Having said that, in order to avoid any risks with linking there need to be better understanding, for all actors involved, of humanitarian principles in development context, how these are translated and operationalised because any type of link need to be executed with consciousness and with clarity. The difference between humanitarian and development practitioners in terms of linking the two sectors was that humanitarian practitioners were more aware of the potential risks connected with this, part of which the risk of losing principled action.

Both development and humanitarian practitioners recognised that the fact that they work in respective silos is one of the fundamental problems in linking the two sectors. When the
structures are too separate it is difficult to create meaningful links because a lack of understanding of not only each other’s work but also, to a degree, the reason that there need to be a link. Smaller organisations may have it easier in avoiding the development of these kinds of silos as smaller offices and fewer staff causes people to know more about each other’s work. Participants from smaller organisations such as the Swedish Mission Council explained that informal collaboration in the office help break down the silos to a degree, part of this can be because their humanitarian and development personnel work in the same unit. Participants from Save the Children, a larger organisation, expressed that there might be thoughts and ambition for better collaboration but that they are not organised in a way to allow it to happen naturally (Humanitarian practitioner, Save the Children).

The institutional challenges are increasingly complicated by the fact that much of the work done is done on project basis, dependent on funding from external actors. The silo working is similar to the dilemma of the chicken and the egg; which came first? Whether it is the funding structures that cause organisations to have similar structures or if it is the structures of the organisations that cause funding structures to work the way they do, either way, they are mutually enforcing.

6.1.3 Funding gap
Humanitarian and development practitioner diverged the most in their attitudes around funding systems and donor rules, and many of the discussions around funding naturally ended up being discussions about Sida’s systems and requirements. Development practitioners expressed optimism over the fact that their CIVSAM funding has opened up for activities that can be seen as way to link, such as resilience activities, and that they experienced flexibility in what they could do under those kind of funding streams. Humanitarian participants on the other hand were not as optimistic. While the opening up of the CIVSAM for more funding for the grey area activities is a window of opportunity for development practitioners, humanitarian actors wanting to include any such aspects in their humanitarian programs have not experienced such flexibility. Having said that, Sida might be doing right in encouraging the development community to engage with resilience, capacity building and DRR but if it has negative effects on the humanitarian action it becomes dangerous because it risks that fewer lives are saved and lesser suffering is alleviated. One might hope that the example with the Red Cross losing funding for their programs in Bangladesh is an exception and that perhaps Sida itself is finding its footing in this way of working and that through clarifications things will be better.
After speaking to both humanitarian and development actors though, all of which referred one way or the other to the funding streams from Sida, I got the sense that CIVSAM, which, based on the definitions of development, is politically governed, was more flexible and organisations were free to put whatever types of programs under that funding mechanism than was the humanitarian funding mechanisms, in particular Rapid Response Mechanisms. That development actors could experience flexibility in their traditionally politically governed funding and humanitarian actors, who should act in accordance with the humanitarian principles of neutrality and impartiality experience rigidity warrants the question of which of the two mechanisms is more politically governed?

Donors, and in particular Sida, need to be clearer on what they expect from CIVSAM and Humanitarian strategic partners respectively and how they perceive the need to link these two types of action. Not until the donors give clear messages of what they expect will there be any clear results.

6.2 Research question 2
How do the attitudes and understanding among practitioners of Humanitarian and Development assistance respectively affect the opportunity to collaborate?

There is generally a will and a drive from both humanitarian and development practitioners to bridge the gaps between the two types of action. Even though the international community, including the major donors, call for enhanced engagement between humanitarian and development actors, their systems and structures do not allow for this and as such it comes down to the commitment and drive of the individual practitioners to do what they can, albeit limited. There is great momentum but the links need to be formalised which requires capacity building, political will and funding.

Of all the humanitarian practitioners participating in this study three had previously been working in the development sector and were strong advocate to bridge the two sectors. The one humanitarian practitioner who was somewhat apprehensive had only worked in the humanitarian sector. This could be an indication that better understanding of each of the sectors produces more motivation to bridge. Having said that, the need to bridge and its implications are questions driven mostly by the humanitarian community, which was apparent
in this study as all the interviews with humanitarian participants lasted longer as these participants generally had more to say. This may perhaps be because it is the humanitarian community that have had to respond to the ever increasing humanitarian demands while development actors have to a degree been able continued with business as usual. What is called by Barnett (2011) emergency humanitarianism must never loose its role and will always be relevant, sticking with the humanitarian principles, but the nature of crises has change and the needs are different and therefore the way in which we address the needs of the affected populations need to change as well. More complex contexts with natural disasters combined with conflict, protracted crisis, requires development actors to step up and need to focus on the coming needs, not what has been seen before. Perhaps the World Humanitarian Summit, with the theme from delivering aid to ending needs, should instead have been a World Development Summit in that many of the issues discussed were things that would more naturally fall under the development sector. If development actors would respond to this, humanitarian actors would not have to be concerned about loosing humanitarian space or loose funding to grey-zone activities because they would be taken care of by development actors. The fact that the majority of concerns came from humanitarian actors could be because they would feel the potential implications the most and those risks should be taken seriously.

Part of this problem is the lack of understanding among practitioners of each other’s work as well as what meaningful links or bridges entail. The humanitarian section at Save the Children for instance wanted to work on DRR because of an understanding of its importance and saw a need but could not access the funding for it because it is placed at Sida under the CIVSAM (Humanitarian practitioner, Save the Children). There are two solutions to this. One is that Sida open up their allocation rules for organisations to determine on their own where what funding is more applicable. The other solution is for the development actors to increase their understanding and efforts in needs of prevention.

Something that became clear during the study was that in order to achieve meaningful and successful links between humanitarian and development action, there is a need for extensive capacity building on many different levels. Firstly on a global level, as was suggested by one of the humanitarian practitioners, there is a need for a discussion on how the humanitarian principles can be translated and applied in to a development context. The absence of a comprehensive discussion on the role of the humanitarian principles in the links between humanitarian and development action is unfortunate. Whether the conclusion of such a
discussion would be that humanitarian principles are compatible with development contexts or not, a discussion would at least make the issue visible. Secondly, donors and organisations need to clarify what they mean with bridging humanitarian and development action. Talking about full spectrum programming is not enough if the stakeholders do not understand why it is important and how it is executed. As was suggested by a development practitioner, people need to understand how their work falls in to the intervention cycle and how it connects with the next phase. Both donors and aid organisations need to be clear of what their aim is in this regard, whether it only is a clarification of a previously held position or if it is a position to take. This is connected to the third level of capacity building, which is on staff level. Both humanitarian and development staff need better understanding of each other’s work and how it is connected. Directors and managers should encourage transfers between sectors. The humanitarian practitioner from the Swedish Church had observed that in organisations connected to the Swedish Church, as well as in this persons own professional network, there is an increase of people that have worked many years with development moving to the humanitarian sector and working many years in that sector. This movement between the sector is a building a capacity of people that can work with one foot in each context and have a broader view, and this trend can be seen around the world (Humanitarian practitioner, Swedish Church, Uppsala 11 April 2017). Similarly does the capacity of local staff need to be strengthened so that contingency plans can be kept updated and relevant and if they have to be put in use, local personnel will have the confidence and capacity to do so.

6.3 Research question 3

What activities can be identified as ways to bridge the gaps?

As this thesis focuses on the things obstructing the potential links between humanitarian and development action rather than the actual link, most of the things that have emerged are things that need to be done in order to enable a bridge rather than direct bridging activities. However, the Swedish Church explained that there is an obvious link in methods and programs that can work in both humanitarian and development contexts. They gave the examples of the work in preventing and providing support when there is sexual and gender-based violence as well as providing psychosocial support (development and humanitarian practitioners, Swedish Church). Both of these types of programs are applicable and appropriate for both emergency and long-term interventions. Another activity that would be a
direct bridging activity is the combination of well-produced and applied exit plans that in turn could feed in to contingency plans. If part of the humanitarian exit plans, being context specific, was to in some way to communicate the lessons learned to the development actors in charge of producing the contingency plans so that these can be based on those previous experiences. This however must be accompanied with the necessary resources to ensure the capacity will be maintained. This leads to the things that need to be done before there can be meaningful links between humanitarian and development action.

Most of the things that need to be improved in order for any type of link between humanitarian and development action can become meaningful and successful are dependent on political will from all actors involved and governments, donors, NGO’s as well as individual practitioners need to commit fully and allocate the necessary resources. The aid industry needs to increase understanding of the concepts of bridging humanitarian and development across and within all stakeholding organisations. A large problem lies in the different understandings of what bridging humanitarian and development means. It is clear that the aim is to streamline international aid but some interpret it as the collaboration between the two, others worry that it is an attempt to transform aid organisations to serve political purposes. It is therefore of paramount importance that donors in particular clarify their perspective on how and why to bridge, and communicate this to the receiving organisations. While donors can and should encourage collaboration between humanitarian and development it is important that this encouragement does not take away attention or funding for current humanitarian needs. Donors should also optimise the value in diversity of organisations and as such also trust in each organisation’s expertise and specialisation. Having said that, it is important to note that diversity in organisations is important and an added value encourage specialisation as well as trust this expertise which could then allow for less rigid donor rules. One thing that the aid industry and in particular donors could consider is to find other methods for funding other than project based so that there can be better coherence between programs.

Individual organisations on the other hand can do many things that facilitate better links between the humanitarian and development sections and programs. First of all they can formalise informal practises of collaboration so that they are strengthened within the organisations. What is now done on the basis of individual drive and commitment can thus be sustained and intensified. Also, to enhance understanding of the different forms of assistance,
organisations can encourage movement of personnel between the two sectors. With more people understanding both types of action, the more likely meaningful links can be created. Another practical suggestion for organisations that work with both humanitarian and development assistance is to instead of having these divided in to different sections or units divided there could be geographically determined units, which could enable collaboration across the humanitarian and development work.

7. Conclusion

This thesis has contributed with empirical understanding of the perception and experiences of practitioners of the gaps between humanitarian and development assistance. This in turn has highlighted a problem with the call for, and efforts in, trying to bridge humanitarian and development action. Through this study it can be concluded that while the international community may be moving in the right direction in calling for mainstreaming of international aid, they have failed to address the obstacles to achieve this. Organisations working with both humanitarian and development aid are in good positions to start harmonisation between the two types of aid, but this study has proven that even though practitioners have a willingness and drive to bridge the gaps there are institutional and financial constraints that are too great for them to overcome by themselves. The discussion of better coordination between humanitarian and development action has been going on for a long time but it is only recently that the international community, and in particular the UN, has set the specific goal to enhance the engagement between humanitarian and development actors. If they want to be successful they need to initiate discussions around the institutional and financial constraints on such an engagement, which should also include a discussion on the potential risks. In a field of work that is very practical, in particular humanitarian action, policies and methods like LRRD, Development-Relief and Resilience also need to take in to consideration the practical constraints on implementing such programs, experienced and expressed by practitioners. Instead of moving from LRRD to resilience programming actors need to address the obstacles to such programs before they can be successful. Harmonisation between humanitarian and development action will not be achieved until the constraints experienced by the practitioners are addressed.
While this thesis has studied the experiences and attitudes of practitioners working in Head Quarters, further studies are needed on the experiences of practitioners in the field. While practitioners in the Head quarters are in many ways the links between the donors and the field, field practitioners are the actors closest to the reality and the implications for policy. Another field that needs further study is the compatibility of the humanitarian principles in development contexts. Humanitarian organisations and practitioners diverge in their opinions whether these principles are compatible or not and further studies can provide another step forward to a link between humanitarian and development action.
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Save the Children
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Development practitioner, Uppsala 11 April 2017
Humanitarian practitioner, Uppsala 11 April 2017
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Development practitioner, Stockholm 20 April 2017
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Appendix A- Interview Guide

The aim of this paper is to explain the dynamics between humanitarian and development sectors and how these dynamics affect the opportunity to collaborate to achieve sustainable results. This study will answer the following research questions:

- How do practitioners from NGOs in Sweden, working with both humanitarian and development assistance, understand the temporal, institutional and financial gaps between humanitarian and development assistance?
- How do the attitudes and understanding among practitioners of Humanitarian and Development assistance respectively affect the opportunity to collaborate?
- What activities can be identified as ways to bridge the gaps?

General interview questions:

- How would you define humanitarian assistance?
- How would you define development assistance?
- What is your understanding of the difference between humanitarian and development assistance?
- In your opinion, do you think there is a need to bridge these two?
- What would be the benefits of linking these two?
- What would be the disadvantages of linking these two?
- What are the challenges to better link humanitarian and development efforts?

Temporal:

- In a situation where humanitarian efforts are transitioned in to development efforts, or when development efforts need to transition to humanitarian efforts, how is that transition coordinated at the HQ?
- How would you motivate what sector should be responsible for rehabilitation assistance after crisis?
- How do you go about providing assistance in protracted crisis where the needs may be of both humanitarian and developmental character?
- How much does the fact that you are part of a larger global network affect your ability to design your programs? (IFRC, SCI, ACT-Alliance, Plan International)

Institutional:
- How do you balance the neutrality principle with the need to work with national and local authorities in humanitarian settings?
- How does the humanitarian principles, in particular neutrality and impartiality affect your efforts in providing recovery assistance?
- How are the humanitarian principles taken in account in the planning stages of a humanitarian project?
- What kind of measures do you take to make the humanitarian assistance you provide sustainable?
- What do you do when disaster disrupts your development programs?
- How do you incorporate contingency planning in development programs?
- Would you say that there is sufficient knowledge about each other’s work across the sectors?

Funding/Financing:
- To what extent would you say funding mechanisms support good links between relief and development?
- How does the funding mechanisms affect the opportunity to be flexible in your programs?
- Does your organisation provide humanitarian and development assistance simultaneously in any country?
- Would funding incentives move you to collaborate more with the other sector?
- How do donor rules affect the way in which you plan your programs?
- Do they allow for longer-term perspectives?
Appendix B- Quotations

[Quote 1. Section 5.2.1 pp. 27 Development practitioner Swedish Church] Det är viktigt att brygga för att man ska kunna plocka upp det arbetet som man redan har gjort i det humanitära och att det ska tas vidare till det långsiktiga.

[Quote 2. Section 5.2.2 pp. 29 Humanitarian practitioner Swedish Church] Den humanitära insatsen kan vara akut, men personens liv som det påverkar är alltid långsiktigt.


[Quote 5. Section 5.3.2 pp 34 Humanitarian practitioner Plan International] Interview held in English.


[Quote 7. Section 5.4.1 pp 37 Development practitioner Swedish Mission Council] Det är för mycket stupröstänk inom biståndsindustrin…men världen kan inte så lätt delas upp i två stuprör, och vad händer med allt som faller emellan, som inte naturligt faller i respektive sektorerna?

[Quote 8. Section 5.4.2 pp 39 Humanitarian practitioner Plan International] Interview held in English.