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**Abstract:**

More and more natural and man-made disasters are occurring and there is a constant need to respond to these disasters in more efficient ways (Schultz & Blecken 2010). Humanitarian organizations are looking for better ways to respond at the same time as corporate engagement in the field has grown (Thomas & Fritz 2006), in part because there are several cross-learning possibilities and benefits to gain from corporate-humanitarian partnerships (Van Wassenhove 2006). The most common form of corporate engagement in the field is still through CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) activities and monetary donations. However, there are several notable opportunities in corporate-humanitarian engagement that haven’t been thoroughly studied.

This thesis focuses on increasing the understanding of corporate-humanitarian partnership building in a humanitarian relief context and from a resource-based perspective. The resource-based perspective provides means for understanding how internal company resources and capabilities are strengthened to create competitiveness (Grant 2010). In this study, the resource-based view has been used, together with collaboration and supply chain literature, to understand how capability building comes forth as a reason for corporate-humanitarian partnership building and how such partnerships can strengthen the competitiveness of a company. This was achieved through a qualitative case study of the Swedish company Peepoople, who have invented a scalable and easily distributable single-use toilet to prevent diseases spreading in emergency situations.

The results of the study indicate that capability building is a driver for corporate-humanitarian partnership building. Still, this capability building arises mainly as a result of more practical first hand outcomes. Interestingly, in the study results it was shown that access to emergency disaster areas could be viewed as a VRIN resource (Barney 1991) that humanitarian organizations have. From the corporate perspective the partnership in itself could be concluded to be a resource and the management and accomplishment of a successful partnership could be seen as essential for even realizing a company’s internal competitive potential.
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1 INTRODUCTION

There is increasing occurrence of natural and man-made disasters globally and therefore more efficient international responses to these disasters are sought (Schultz & Blecken 2010). There is a need for humanitarian actors and agencies to look for “more effective and efficient solutions” to be prepared enough for increasing turbulence in the field (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove 2009:549). It is acknowledged that there are many cross-learning possibilities for both businesses and humanitarians in the field of humanitarian relief operations (Van Wassenhove 2006). Recently there has been a trend towards greater corporate engagement in humanitarian relief operations and many companies have an interest in engaging in long-term partnerships with humanitarian actors (Van Wassenhove & Tomasini 2009:557). “Recently, many “traditional” transportation companies such as DHL or TNT logistics have entered the scene of disaster relief operations, establishing partnerships with the UN” (Kovacs & Spens 2007:103). Another example is the Asian tsunami in 2004 where there were more corporate responses than ever before, but no coordination and no proper information flow, which made the situation very difficult for humanitarian actors (Thomas & Fritz 2006).

Problems occurring from lack of water and sanitation are a very pressing concern in disaster struck areas, since disasters increase the risk of outbreaks of infectious diseases. The most common cause of diseases spreading is fecal contamination of water and food (Widdus 2001). In the aftermath of disasters the mortality rates in camps can be 20-30 times higher than under “normal” circumstances. “The interaction of malnutrition, crowding, poor environmental sanitation, and changes in host parasite relationships due to migration or environmental change, result in communicable diseases playing a major role in excess morbidity and mortality.” (Shears 1991:241) For example seven months after the earthquake in Haiti in 2010, 30 percentages of the camps did not have any kind of toilets and most of the other camps had only common latrines or holes dug in the ground as toilets. Peepooole is a Swedish-based company that has developed a new solution for sanitation problems in slum and disaster areas. The Peepoo single-use toilet provides a new way of addressing sanitation problems, because it is the only available solution that could be rapidly deployed to save lives after large scale emergencies. One of the innovative elements of the Peepoo single-use toilet is that it needs no water to function. Still, the problem Peepoo is now facing is that the product as well as the company is quite new and efficient means of distribution in
emergency situations are required. Peepople therefore plans, in addition to large scale production, to seek partnerships with humanitarian actors to solve the distribution challenges they face in emergency response at the moment. (Peepople 2012) Peepople will be the case company in this study.

Monetary donations are still the most usual kind of corporate engagement with the humanitarian sector, but there are other options occurring for transferring expertise and creating mutual learning for both the corporate and humanitarian side. (Van Wassenhove, Tomasini & Stapleton 2008). In the literature concerning corporate engagement in humanitarian relief corporate engagement is mostly talked about in terms of CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) or CSR-related engagement (Van Wassenhove & Tomasini 2009; van Wassenhove et al. 2008; Maon et al. 2009). CSR is also acknowledged to provide competitive advantage for a company (Porter & Kramer 2006). What makes the case company Peepople interesting is that their main business field is slums and disaster struck areas. They are not seeking partnership with an NGO because of CSR-related reasons, because their product is targeted towards disaster areas in itself.

Corporate-humanitarian partnerships that allow the parties to share knowledge, expertise, and best practice can result in more efficient ways of responding to disasters, distributing aid, and especially preparing for and mitigating disasters. These alliances have significant potential to deliver across-the-board benefits to the partners and the people and communities affected by disasters (Van Wassenhove et al., 2008:6).

This quote highlights the possible benefits of corporate-humanitarian partnerships. Still these benefits are seldom clearly spoken about, but presented in a very general manner. Schultz and Blecken (2010:634) have identified opportunities in horizontal cooperation in the humanitarian supply chain, but still they conclude that “not all potential benefits have yet been realized” and there is no holistic picture of corporate-humanitarian collaboration. There is also a need for further research in cooperation and collaboration within the humanitarian field given that both vertical and horizontal cooperation have obstacles to overcome (Jahre, Listou & Jensen 2009). As Kovács and Spens (2011) point out, there is still a need for more research in the area of humanitarian logistics and humanitarian logistics practices. This indicates that there is potential for further discussing and studying corporate-humanitarian partnerships. This will be undertaken in this thesis in the light of the case company Peepople.
1.1. Problem Formulation

Despite significant investments in the sector in recent decades made by governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), bilateral and multilateral agencies, and the private sector, the outlook for access to safe and adequate supplies of water and environmentally sustainable sanitation remains grim (Bosch et al. 2002:373).

This quotation underlines the very scarce development in water and sanitation issues globally in recent years. According to Gröber et al. (2011) sanitation is a business opportunity and there ought to be more market-based approaches trying to solve water and sanitation problems. There is also a need for more collaboration between the private and the public sector to deal with sanitation issues (Gröber et al. 2011). Widdus (2001) proposes public-private partnerships as a means for tackling the problem of access to essential drugs for poor and disaster-struck populations. The basic mechanisms he presents could also be useful for other types of access, for example to water and sanitation. To identify and develop effective, scalable and sustainable solutions to sanitation, with economic potential benefits, has been a major challenge thus far (Gröber et al. 2011). Therefore the Peepoo single-use toilet solution, presented by the case company Peepoople, seems like a viable option for solving this problem. But Peepoople is still struggling with finding proper distribution and partnership solutions.

The resource-based view (RBV) of the firm argues that a company’s resources and capabilities are the source of its competitive advantage (Barney 1991). The RBV has primarily been used in the realm of humanitarian logistics when, for example, discussing risk management and how to manage disruptions in the humanitarian supply network (Kovács & Tatham 2009). In discussion about the specific set of skills needed to be a humanitarian logistician (Tatham, Kovács & Larson 2012 Forthcoming) the RBV has also proven to be a useful tool.

In RBV the resources and capabilities create value and competitiveness through a firm’s performance, and therefore researchers’ need to “get at the elements of interest is by following the value generation trail backwards to its source” (Rouse & Daellenbach 2002:966) By studying corporate-humanitarian partnerships and partnership building from a corporate perspective, this research will follow “the trail” in order to understand the capabilities and strategic benefits that the literature indicates exist in these kinds of partnerships. In this way this thesis can contribute to the perspectives of RBV as well as to the field of studies in humanitarian logistics. My focus is on the corporate perspective and the non-financial benefits such as distribution channels and supply
chain capacities, information sharing, knowledge acquisition and capability building through corporate-humanitarian partnerships.

There is a need for a more thorough vision if the aim is to achieve solutions for sharing distribution channels and processes among different actors in the humanitarian relief context. To be efficient in terms of cost and speed, as well as to eliminate redundancies there is a need for shared supply chain management approaches among the actors involved (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove 2009:549) A supply chain partnership is created through a process of collaboration aiming at mutual benefits. It is also customized and based on risk and reward sharing as well as trust and it leads to better supply chain performance (Lambert, Knemeyer & Gardner 2004). In the field of humanitarian relief aid most of the corporate involvement has happened through monetary donation, but exchange of expertise is emerging more rapidly. There are potential benefits of more cooperation in the field, but many pitfalls still remain and some partnerships don’t function as well as others. (Van Wassenhove et al. 2008)

Mangan et al. (2008:340) conclude that the concept of SC collaboration got a kick-start in the 1990’s that resulted in an unexpected amount of integration efforts across company boundaries. But although the development of conceptual frameworks and business models to enable collaboration and integration has been developed ever since, the implementation of them has been lagging behind, leaving many questions open regarding the actual success of these collaborative efforts. Some strategic collaborative supply chains have succeeded in creating extra value and some have not, and there is still no unanimous explanation of why this is the case. (Fawcett et al. 2008a:36) Also, there has been far less implementation of collaborative strategies than expected, probably due to the difficulties related to supply chain collaboration (Holweg et al. 2005:170; Barrat 2004:30) McLachlin and Larson (2011) claim that too little has been written about relationship and partnership building in the humanitarian sector and that there is a need for this, since the humanitarian community has been criticized for a lack of collaborative efforts. Corporate engagement has got some attention in the literature (Thomas & Fritz, 2006; Maon et al. 2009), but few studies have been conducted focusing on the partnership factors that, through a strategic benefits perspective, would spur and motivate a company to engage in partnership with a humanitarian actor. Collaboration is always about mutual benefits (Mangan et al. 2008), but in this study the corporate side will be in focus. Therefore this thesis will focus on exploring corporate-humanitarian relationships from a resource-based
perspective. This way the thesis will contribute to the humanitarian logistics literature by looking at collaborative partnership efforts from a corporate angle through the example of the case company Peepoople, adding the RBV perspective to the discussion.

The theory and empirical study will be aimed at exploring the corporate drivers of engagement and the resource-related outcomes of the partnership. By combining literature about humanitarian logistics, the resource-based view (RBV), and collaboration the theoretical part of this thesis is aiming at creating a theoretical framework for corporate-humanitarian partnerships building.

1.2. Aim

The aim of this thesis is to increase the understanding of how corporate capabilities can be strengthened and built through corporate-humanitarian partnerships.

The empirical focus of this thesis is on the corporate perspective of the case company Peepoople and how Peepoople can develop its supply chain capabilities through building corporate-humanitarian partnerships.

1.2.1. Research Questions

To achieve the research aim the study is divided between a theoretical aim and research questions.

Theoretical Aim:

- To construct a theoretical framework for building corporate-humanitarian partnerships from a resource-based perspective.

Research Questions:

- How does capability building come forth as a reason for building a corporate-humanitarian partnership?
- How can a company strengthen its competitiveness through a corporate-humanitarian partnership?
- How can the corporate-humanitarian partnership model, built through the theoretical framework, be developed and adjusted to suit Peepoople’s needs concerning partnership building with humanitarian organizations?
1.3. Definitions

**Humanitarian Aid:** Humanitarian aid is to “carry out relief operations to assist victims of disasters, and combines this with development work to strengthen the capacities of its member National Societies.” Humanitarian aid should be carried out without discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. Humanitarian aid includes disaster preparedness, disaster response, and health and community care. (IFRC 2011)

**Humanitarian Logistics:** Humanitarian logistics is usually defined as “the process of planning, implementing and controlling the efficient, cost effective flow and storage of goods and materials as well as related information from the point of origin to the point of consumption for the purpose of alleviating the suffering of vulnerable people.” (Thomas 2004:67)

**Humanitarian Organization:** A humanitarian organization is an organization that provides humanitarian aid by the principles of humanity, neutrality, and impartiality, meaning that everyone in need will be helped and no group will be favoured before another. The humanitarian organization does not influence for example a conflict outcome, but acts as an impartial actor in a disaster setting (Van Wassenhove 2006).

**Supply Chain Management:** According to Slack et al., (2010:375) “a supply chain is a strand of linked operations” and supply chain management (SCM) involves the management of all the organizations that are related to one another in their relations up- and downstream in the supply chain. All supply chain processes are linked together in order to produce value to the end consumer. (Slack et al. 2010.)

**Supply Chain Collaboration:** Collaboration is long-term supply chain relationship requiring integration, commitment, and a common mission among supply chain parties (Winer and Ray, 1994). Collaboration is expressed through the inter-related tasks and elements of information sharing and collaborative communication, decision synchronization, incentive alignment, joint knowledge creation, resource sharing and incentive and goal alignment. (McLachlin & Larsen 2011:34.)

**Supply Chain Partnership:** A partnership is a “closely integrated, mutually beneficial relationship that enhances supply chain performance”. The key point in a partnership is that it is a customized supply chain relationship based on openness and trust, and risk and reward sharing that leads to better performance than the
partnership parties would have achieved without the partnership. (Lambert et al. 2004:22.)

**Corporate-humanitarian partnership:** A corporate-humanitarian partnership is classified as a ‘humonetaryian’ (McLachlin & Larson 2011), business-nonprofit partnership aiming at either integrative or transactional projects (Selsky & Parker 2005).

**Resource:** A firm’s resources are strengths that are used in order to create and implement the firm’s strategy (Barney 1991).

**Capability:** A capability is what a firm can achieve and do with its own resources, in order to create long-lasting competitive advantage and strategic benefits (Grant 2010).

### 1.4. Limitations

This is a case study that focuses on how corporate capabilities can be built through corporate-humanitarian partnerships. The focus is especially on the corporate perspective of the partnership and on the perspective of the case company, Peepoople, on their partnership building process. The focus is in place in order to create a deeper understanding of the issue. The theoretical framework is constructed in order to understand capabilities and strategic benefits that arise from a corporate-humanitarian partnership, whereas other aspects of the partnership outcome won’t be deeply discussed. Supply chain collaboration literature is taken into account as a means of understanding the partnership process and to get a holistic picture of the subject, but the empirical study will not go into detail considering the collaborative elements of the partnership, but rather acknowledge them and stay focused on the drivers as well as outcomes of the partnership. Partnership types other than corporate-humanitarian ones will not be examined. Evaluation methods will assess model-oriented approaches and non-financial measures of partnerships. This study will focus on the RBV perspective on an aggregated level, focusing on the building of partnerships.

The empirical part of the study will be limited to the case company Peepoople. The Peepoople data will also be narrowed so as only to concern the Peepoople Emergency Response business unit (see organizational chart in appendix 4). The choice of research method and sampling strategy will be discussed and examined in order to get a relevant result.
1.5. Method

Given the explorative nature of the aim and research questions in this thesis, a qualitative approach is taken in the empirical study (Patton 2002). Since a deeper understanding of the research topic is the goal, a case study methodology has been chosen in order to get a holistic picture of one case (Gummesson 2000). The unit of analysis in this case will be the case company Peepoople. Both criterion sampling as well as critical case sampling (Eisenhardt 1989) has been used in order to choose the case company in question. Semi-structured interviews allow the researcher a structure for comparing the data collected, but give some flexibility in terms of questions in the actual interview situation (Patton 2002). Therefore semi-structured interviews have been used to conduct the data collection in the empirical part. In addition, data triangulation (Silverman 2006) has been conducted by using internal company data as additional empirical material in the analysis.

1.6. Structure

In chapter 2, focusing on theory, The field of study, humanitarian relief operations, and the specificities related to this field, will be presented. After this the theoretical concepts of the study will be presented. First I will discuss the resource-based perspective of the firm and after this the concept of supply chain collaboration and partnerships will be discussed. The theory chapter will end with a theoretical framework created for corporate-humanitarian partnership building. The framework, consisting of five interlinked steps, combines the different theoretical areas presented, according to the theoretical aim presented in section 1.2.1 about the research questions.

In chapter three the qualitative research method and empirical study will be presented. The analysis and the results will then be further discussed in chapter 4, managerial implications and conclusions are presented in chapter 5. The research quality and suggestions for further research is presented in the end of chapter 5. An executive summary in Swedish is found at the end of the study.
2 CORPORATE-HUMANITARIAN PARTNERSHIPS FROM AN RBV PERSPECTIVE

This chapter begins with a presentation of the field of study; humanitarian relief operations, and the specificities related to this field, which combined to for a context for this study. After, the theoretical concepts of the study will be presented. First, the resource-based perspective (RBV) of the firm will be discussed and after this the concepts of supply chain collaboration and partnerships will be presented, since the process of collaboration is essential for discussion and understanding partnerships. These concepts will then be combined and related to the field of study. In figure 1 the relationships in this thesis are illustrated. The aim of this chapter is to build a theoretical framework on which to base the forthcoming empirical study where the corporate strategic benefits of corporate-humanitarian partnerships will be evaluated. The framework will be presented in the end of this chapter.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 1  Relationships between theory and field of study

2.1. Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management

Humanitarian relief operations will be presented as the context in which the partnership takes place. Understanding the humanitarian context gives an understanding of the specificities related to corporate-humanitarian partnerships. Understanding the challenges of the humanitarian context is of utmost importance, since the aim is to increase understanding of partnerships in which humanitarian organizations engage.
An increasing number of disasters are sweeping across the globe and more efficient responses to these are needed. Still, the complexity of the field is causing many problems for humanitarian logisticians (Tatham & Houghton 2011). In broad terms a disaster can be defined as “a disruption that physically affects a system as a whole and threatens its priorities and goals” (Van Wassenhove 2006:476). Disasters vary very much in scale, cause and effect (Kovács & Spens 2009:508) and Van Wassenhove (2006:457) explains disasters according to whether they are natural or man-made, sudden- or slow-onset (table 1). All these disaster types are related with different challenges, but all disasters are characterized by the complexity of the operational environment for relief agencies.

Table 1  Explaining Disasters (from Van Wassenhove 2006:457)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Man-made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudden-onset</td>
<td>Earthquake, Hurricane, Tornadoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow-onset</td>
<td>Famine, Drought, Poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to the challenges related to different disaster types, Kovács and Spens (2009) further elaborate on the division made by Van Wassenhove (2006) in discussing complex emergencies. The issue concerning complex is that the actions by human beings can make natural phenomena, like floods, even more devastating.

Humanitarian logistics is logistics activities in humanitarian aid after man-made and natural disasters, as well as complex emergencies such as conflict situations. The context of humanitarian logistics can be described as “unpredictable, turbulent and requiring flexibility” (Jahre & Jensen 2009:1008), because the disaster relief operations are distinguished by the urgency and the high levels of uncertainty especially in the initial phases of the response. The thing that makes humanitarian supply chains most different from commercial supply chains is that humanitarian organizations seek a balance between cost and speed, whereas a commercial supply chain seeks profit. But humanitarian supply chains do also differ from commercial ones because of the limited capital and human resources, the high uncertainty levels, the often political environment and the ambiguous objectives. (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove 2009:550-551.)
2.1.1. The Context of Humanitarian Relief Operations

There are several models for disaster relief operations (Van Wassenhove, 2006; Kovács & Spens, 2007a; Maon et al. 2009). Most models include a preparedness phase, a response phase, a recovery phase and a mitigation phase (Maon et al. 2009:150). The phases of disaster relief operations can also be described as: 1. Disaster preparedness 2. Disaster response and 3. Disaster management (Van Wassenhove 2006:481) or in terms of the phases: 1. Preparation 2. Immediate response, and 3. Reconstruction (Kovács & Spens 2007a:101). Basically it can be concluded that when a disaster strikes, a supply chain is activated. Preparations are activated, needs assessment is carried out, donations and procurement is activated, specific personnel and trained staff are assigned to tasks and the process is set in motion (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove 2009). In figure 2 a dual cycle model of disaster relief operations, developed by Maon et al. (2009:151) is presented. The model emphasizes the fact that the stages of relief operations aren’t mutually exclusive, but sometimes overlapping due to the fact that they are often interrelated. For example, mitigation and reconstruction often happen simultaneously, which can in fact be ideal. This model is especially useful when further discussing different kinds of cross-sector collaboration initiatives in humanitarian relief operations.
The type of response to a particular disaster varies according to the disaster type (Kovács & Spens 2007a:101), but the five key elements in this preparation process are the human resources, the knowledge management, the process management, the resources, and the community, since without proper preparation the relief operations can’t function efficiently (Van Wassenhove 2006). In terms of operational performance the interesting part is how organizations shift between the stages in the relief operation, shifting the focus from speed in the first phase to cost reduction in the final phases (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove 2009:550).

The humanitarian community is a complex system consisting of aid beneficiaries, UN agencies, NGOs, governments, military units, donors (McLachlin & Larson 2011) and the operational context of humanitarian relief operations can be assigned the following characteristics (Stephenson 2005:341):

- Multiple organizations with multiple missions and frames of accountability

- Participating organizations agree that relief should be carried out efficiently, but are hindered in actually executing this due to differing missions and values
• High stakes for participating organizations
• The ties between aid organizations are usually varying and occur only periodically
• Mistakes in operations are likely due to the complex environment of operations
• The staff turnover in most organizations is high
• The actual facts and information is disputed and often unclear
• The time pressure is extremely high
• The capacities of the host nation differs from one disaster area to another

2.1.2. Challenges in Humanitarian Relief Operations

The challenges related to humanitarian logistics are important to consider in the research context of the thesis, since they will affect the partnerships created and can be of importance when evaluating corporate-humanitarian partnerships. Thanks to better communication, improved processes, early warning systems, and other measures, the impact of disasters has been reduced in recent years. Still several challenges remain in the area of humanitarian relief operations. (Maon et al. 2009) Disasters test the reactivity of the system and the abilities of organization to work with each other.

Getting different actors to work together by sharing processes and distribution channels demands a vision that goes beyond mere logistics [...] It requires a supply chain management approach to effectively coordinate performance, eliminate redundancies, and maximize efficiencies in term of cost and speed (Tomasini and Van Wassenhove, 2009:549).

The specific challenges related to humanitarian logistics have a lot to do with the operational contexts of the activities (Stephenson 2005), but also with the complexity of the humanitarian community. The community itself faces problems related to the massive and sudden workload that appears when a disaster strikes, the lack of trust among humanitarian and other actors, and political interests of certain actors (McLachlin & Larson 2011). Also the different stages of disaster relief operations pose varying challenges to the actors. For example preparedness itself is a challenge, since it is already too late to be rectifying glitches when a disaster strikes. Also the uncertainty that characterizes relief operations will be a big challenge at all stages. (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove 2011)

Humanitarians also face great challenges in collaboration, since the humanitarian supply chain lacks the clear command and control mechanisms, the profit motive and
in addition to this, SC priorities fluctuate with constant change. Different kinds of collaboration and partnerships could be of great help for small NGOs that struggle with managing a global humanitarian supply chain. Still, relationship building is hard, especially if new relationships are to be built. Also the sheer number of parties involved presents a challenge to partnerships. Collaborating with businesses can be one way of managing these problems and these kinds of collaborative relationships can for example help deliver goods and services to beneficiaries as well as develop capabilities. (McLachlin & Larson, 2011) On a more general level the humanitarian supply chain operations can be improved by measuring issues, coordinating and strategizing, as well as learning from previous relief operations (Maon et al. 2009).

2.2. The Resource-based View (RBV) of the Firm

In this chapter the resource-based view (RBV) of the firm will be discussed. RBV will be used to gain an understanding of the resources and capabilities that are potentially created in a corporate-humanitarian partnership. In order to be able to evaluate specific benefits stemming from a partnership, a firm has to be able to recognize and know its existing resources and capabilities. RBV can also be applied on other organizations, except for corporations. The RBV perspective insight is of most importance in step one and four in the framework presented in the last section of the theory chapter.

Firm-specific factors are more important than environmental or industry-structure characteristics in explaining firm superior performance (Olavarrieta and Ellinger, 1997:561).

This is also the basic stand point of the resource-based view of the firm (RBV). RBV is an attempt to predict, describe, and explain how a firm, by managing its tangible and intangible resources successfully, can gain long-lasting competitive advantage (Rungtusanatham et al. 2003:1087). The focus and primary unit of analysis in RBV is the capabilities and resources of a firm that help comprise the company strategy (Olavarrieta & Ellinger 1997:563). There are several approaches to the RBV of the firm that have evolved since the theory was first introduced. Possibilities for extending RBV into new directions are also possible through interlinking it with new perspectives (Barney 2001; Ketchen & Wright 2011).

Resources can either be acquired from the market or then they can be developed inside the firm (Olavarrieta & Ellinger 1997). RBV is also useful for studying the relationships between a firm’s capabilities and performance (DeSarbo, Di Benetto & Song 2007) as
well as for understanding the linkages between firm resources, capabilities, and strategy (Grant 2010). The RBV contains two basic underlying assumptions (Barney 1991:101; Clegg et al. 2006:131):

1) It assumes firm heterogeneity, meaning that there are a variety of resources and capabilities between firms

2) It assumes that resources are somewhat immobile, meaning that the heterogeneity can be long-lasting

The RBV is “an inside-out perspective on organizations” (Rouse & Daellenbach 2002:966) and claims that to be competitive, a firm needs to acquire, and control a whole package of resources containing different capabilities, so that these tangible and intangible resources can function as key inputs into the production process (Rungtusanatham et al. 2003:1089).

2.2.1. The ‘VRIN’ Characteristics of a Resource

To understand and evaluate resources in a firm it is crucial for the firm to understand how to enhance its competitiveness. The key criteria in evaluating resources are how important they are and what strengths and weaknesses they have related to the company’s competitors. Benchmarking can be a good tool for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the resource, because it gives an opportunity to identify and understand the relative strength of a resource or a capability. When evaluating the importance of a resource the competitiveness should be in focus, and therefore the underlying strategic characteristics of the resource should be assessed. (Grant 2010.)

A resource needs to have a specific set of characteristics in order to benefit a firm and help it attain competitive advantage. The resource must be (Barney 1991; Rungtusanatham et al. 2003:1087; Clegg et al. 2006:131):

1) Valuable through enhancing efficiency and/or effectiveness

2) Rare and cause a disadvantage for the firm’s competitors

3) Hard or costly to copy or develop by competitors

4) Un-substitutable or without any close strategic substitutes, so that competitors cannot find strategically equivalent resources to be used for the same purpose

The resources and capabilities should, in other words, all be “VRIN” meaning they should be: Valuable, Rare, In-imitable, and Not substitutable in order to provide a sustainable competitive advantage (Barney 1991; Rungtusanatham et al. 2003:1089).
In addition to this, resources should be seen as a bundle and not separately, since a single resource alone is seldom an advantage (Grant 2010). In order for the resources to be hard to acquire by other companies they could contain for example, *social complexity*, meaning how the resource in questions fits the firm and is embedded in the internal social network of the firm makes the resource hard to imitate. Other things that protect resources are the intangibility, which makes it hard to copy. Also possible restrictions and legal protections pose problems for competitors who would want to duplicate the resource. (Rungtusanatham et al. 2003:1088) If the resources are imperfectly mobile - meaning that they can't be bought and sold on the marketplace – it also makes it hard for competitors to acquire them (Besanko et al. 2010).

### 2.2.2. Strategic Benefits and Competitive Advantage

Besanko et al. (2010:415) define competitive advantage as “the ability of a firm to outperform its industry”. The ability to create this competitive value relies on the resources and capabilities of the firm. The value or the strategic benefits that arise from these are indicated by the performance of the firm (Rouse & Daellenbach, 2002). Strategy itself is based on a combination of the internal resources and external opportunities and risks a company has and is surrounded by, so the focus of research can be either on internal or external factors. Still the internal resources are the core of the corporate strategy. These resources create capabilities that in turn become strategic benefits in the form of competitive advantage (Grant 1991).

In addition to this it is important to note that if the external competitive environment of the firm is due to constant change, the internal resources of the firm will be even more important for creating a long-term strategy and competitive advantage (figure 3). The interesting part in this positioning in the market place is that a firm should strive towards exploiting the differences between itself and its competitors. But to be able to do this a firm needs to understand its own resources and capabilities thoroughly. Individual resources can’t alone create competitive advantage, but they need to function together so as to create organizational capability in order to be valuable from a competitive advantage perspective. It is also important to note that the resource or capability in itself needs to be relevant from a context perspective in order to become a strategic benefit and increase competitiveness. (Grant 2010.)
2.2.3. The Classification of Resources in RBV

Firms’ resources are “strengths that firms can use to conceive of and implement their strategies” (Barney 1991:101). Resources have been classified differently in the academic literature. Barney (1991) includes all an organization’s assets, organizational processes, capabilities, information and knowledge as well as company attributes in a classification of a firm’s resources and concludes that the resources are very complex and interdependent. Clegg et al. (2006:131) have made a basic division into four different types of resources: financial resources, physical resources, human resources, and organizational resources. Another method of classification is to make a distinction between resources and capabilities, so that resources are observable assets capable of value and trade, whereas capabilities are non-observable and hard to value. Capabilities change over time and are an in-separable part of a business unit, although they in themselves can have value. (DeSarbo et al. 2007) Grant (2010) classifies resources into the categories of tangible, intangible and human:

- **Tangible resources** are most easy to identify. They consist of for example financial and physical resources
- **Intangible resources** are usually more valuable than tangible resources, although they are “invisible” in the sense that they usually don’t show in the company’s financial statement. For example the company culture, reputation and technology are intangible resources
- **Human resources** consist of the skills or know-how in the firm, the capacity to collaborate and communicate and the motivation of the employees.
Grant (2010:131) also argues that the resources are the productive assets of the firm whereas the capabilities are “what the firm can do”. In other words a capability can be seen as “the efficiency with which a firm uses the inputs [resources] available to it” (Dutta et al. 2004:278). This is in line with Rungtusanatham et al. (2003:1089) who define the capabilities of the firm as the mechanisms and organizational practices that enable the firm to develop and get the resources needed for the facilitation of the production and delivery process of goods and services. Resources can also be classified into three categories: input factors, assets, and capabilities (Olavarrieta & Ellinger 1997:563):

- **Input factors** are common resources that can be acquired from the market. When the input factors are implemented and applied they become firm assets or capabilities that contribute to the output of production. From a logistics standpoint input factors include raw factors and raw skills, for example the transportation fleet and the loading and packaging skills of the employees;

- **Assets** include a bundle of factors that are available, owned and controlled by the firm. Assets are generated through a process of accumulation and investments over time. Most commonly the assets are “visible” resources, but they can be either tangible or intangible. Asset examples can be patents and brand as well as logistics-related assets such as communication technologies and warehouses;

- **Capabilities**, on the other hand, are more complex, since they include bundles of “individual skills, assets and accumulated knowledge exercised through organizational processes, which enable firms to co-ordinate activities and make use of their resources” Examples of capabilities could be the ability to manage supplier relations or work in teams.

The difference here is that while Grant (2010) sees capabilities as different from resources Barney (1991) and Olavarrieta and Ellinger (1997) see capabilities as a resource themselves. Still the definition of capabilities is very much alike and the components of the RBV are the same. The differences in classification of resources are compiled in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input factors</td>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>Intangible</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capabilities</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Organizational processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Firm Attributes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2   The Different classifications of Resources in RBV
In this thesis capabilities will be understood as they are by Grant (2010), meaning that capabilities are what a firm can do and make out of its resources.

2.2.4. Determining and Evaluating Capabilities

Even though the definition of capabilities varies, such as what the company can do with its resources (Grant 2010), or as a part of the company resources (Barney 1991), the essence is that the firm should focus on capabilities that constitute a competitive advantage, i.e. the capabilities that make the firm better at than its competitors. These can be called either distinctive capabilities or core competence (Grant 2010).

One way to approach capability classification is a functional analysis of capabilities, i.e. identifying capabilities in relation to the main functional area in which they occur (Grant 2010). Taking a functional perspective on the capability determination, DeSarbo et al. (2007) conclude that the five most relevant capabilities for study of competitive advantage are: management-related, technology, marketing, market linking, and IT-capabilities.

- **Management-related capabilities** are those that allow a firm to manage, control, and take advantage of all its capabilities. Management capabilities would include for example financial management and human resource management;

- **Technology capabilities** are the ones that allow the firm to operate cost efficiently and differentiate between its products. The logistics functions, product and technology development, and the production and manufacturing processes are technology capabilities;

- **Marketing linking capabilities** are those that allow the firm to know and detect changes in its market environment so that it can compete more effectively. Market linking capabilities include capabilities like monitoring technology, being sensitive about the market changes, and customer and channel linking;

- **Marketing capabilities** help a firm to take advantage of technology and market linking capabilities. Marketing capabilities should strengthen the implementation of marketing programs. For example pricing and advertising, as well as segmentation and targeting are marketing capabilities;

- **IT capabilities** should increase the flexibility of information usage in all of a firm’s functional areas.

This is mainly in line with the capabilities Grant (2010:132) states as general for classification. The capabilities Grant (2010) would consider are related to: corporate
functions, management information, research and development, operations, product design and marketing, and sales and distribution.

Another way of determining key capabilities is presented by Hafeez, Zang and Malak (2002) in figure 4. Here the most important capabilities are derived from an evaluation process, rather than stated beforehand. The whole process involves deconstruction of the resources so that they can be mapped out and prioritized in relation to both the processes and the objectives of the firm.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4** A framework for determining key capabilities (Hafeez et al. 2002:43)

Rather than looking at specific capabilities per se, the Hafeez et al. (2002) model allows the firm to relate the capabilities to its own performance. There are also other ways of classifying capabilities, such as value chain analysis (Grant 2010:132), which uses Porter’s value chain as a basis for classification.

But neither the functional nor the value chain analysis presented by Grant (2010) is classifying capabilities. Capabilities can be seen as either a process or a routine. An organizational process is the “sequence of action through which a specific task is performed” and organizational routines are predictable and repetitive patterns of activity that occur repeatedly. The processes become reliable and efficient only if they transform into routines (Grant 2010:133). Furthermore, it is important to recognize that a firm’s capabilities are the products of these routines and processes. Although the general capabilities can be functionally classified they still interact with each other, so that more specialized capabilities together with more general capabilities form cross-
functional capabilities. This creates a hierarchy of capabilities, where different level capabilities are integrated and structured. The capability hierarchy could for example contain (Grant 2010:134):

1) Cross-functional capabilities
2) Broad functional capabilities
3) Activity related capabilities, coming from operations
4) Specialized capabilities, related to manufacturing
5) Single-task capabilities

The highest level of capabilities (1) requires greatest integration between different functions and is therefore most hard to develop. When measuring capabilities another useful line of thinking is to first try to measure the best possible outcome the company could have achieved with the resources it has as inputs. This has to be evaluated by the firm itself. Then this can be compared with the actual performance of the company. The bigger the gap between the “best possible” and the achieved outcomes, the less efficient the usage of the resources are meaning the capability is quite low. (Dutta et al. 2004:278)

### 2.2.5. Supply Chain Linkages and the Knowledge-based Perspective of RBV

Supply chain management can be seen as one of a company’s foremost capabilities and as an enabler of competitiveness (Fawcett et al. 2008b). Rungtusanatham et al. (2003) address the topic of how a firm’s operational performance can benefit from the linkages with suppliers and customers. They point out that supply chain relationships can be seen as a kind of inter-firm relationship and that RBV has also been used, for example, to look at alliances. Rungtusanatham et al. (2003) claim that the information exchange that takes place between the entities in a supply chain will lead to better quality, an ability to change volume and price quickly and reduce the lead time of deliveries. Also for example, demand uncertainty can be reduced through long-term customer relationships. Rungtusanatham et al. (2003) claim that supply chain linkages positively affects a firm’s operational performance i.e. its operational resources, since

Supply chain linkages as a resource and as a knowledge-acquisition capability that can promise either temporary or sustainable superior operational performance for a firm, depending on whether the VRIN properties of supply chain linkages are defensible (Rungtusanatham et al. 2003:1095).
This claim by Rungtusanatham et al. (2003:1095) is supported by Barney (2012 forthcoming) who claims that supply chain management can have the VRIN attributes needed for it to become a strategically important source of competitive advantage, since SCM can for example be a capability for a firm to “generate more accurate expectations about the future”. Knowledge-acquisition capability links to the knowledge-based value creation view as an extension and development of the RBV (Barney et al. 2011) and is also in line with the statement that much of the uniqueness of intangible resource, especially knowledge-related, should be in focus in RBV-related research (Rouse & Daellenbach, 2002). Supply chain linkages, presented in figure 5, which are motivated by this are (Rungtusanatham et al. 2003:1091-1093):

- In the short-term the supply linkages of a firm are themselves VRIN resources which provide temporary advantages for the firm’s operational performance;

- The sustainability of VRIN resources acquired for the supply chain linkages will be dependent on how well a firm continually can protect and develop them;

- The supply chain linkages will allow a firm to gain VRIN resources in the form of supply-chain knowledge that enhances operational performance

- The extent to which a firm can protect its knowledge-acquisition capabilities will determine whether or not it will enjoy superior operational performance benefits from the connections, compared with its competitors

![Figure 5 Supply Chain linkages and operational performance through the RBV lens (adapted from Rungtusanatham et al. 2003:1094)]
2.3. Supply Chain Collaboration

In this section the concept of supply chain collaboration and supply chain partnerships will be discussed. It is important to understand the basic features of supply chain collaboration, since partnerships build on collaboration (Hieber, 2002). The benefits of collaboration therefore also occur in partnerships. Through supply chain collaboration, benefits such as increased returns on assets, cost reduction, and enhanced supply chain performance can be achieved. Collaboration in supply chains includes for example coordination, joint planning, process integration between suppliers and other partners. (McLaren et al. 2002:348) There are several reasons for companies to collaborate. A few of the drivers, mentioned by Fawcett et al. (2008:37), are more demanding customers, intense competition, globalization of the world economy, compressed product cycles and a constant need for better information and information technologies. But the key, when discussing SC collaboration, is understanding that it is dependent on mutual benefits (Mangan 2008:253) and that the motivation for participants relies in the overall supply chain improvements that can be achieved through collaboration (Simatupang & Sridharan, 2004:9). Benefits deriving from SC collaboration can be grouped together as (Cetindamar et al. 2005:238):

- **Customer-oriented benefits** because of shorter lead-time, better responsiveness, more accurate delivery, better customer satisfaction and better product quality;

- **Productivity benefits** such as development of products and processes, cost reduction and possibility to implement new elements in the production process;

- **Innovation-related benefits**, since cost and time can be reduced through new innovations.

Macro benefits, shared by all collaboration partners can be achieved, because new technologies and innovation can be achieved through collaboration. This will enhance the competitiveness of the whole supply chain. (Cetindamar et al. 2005:240) According to Mangan et al. (2008:346) supply chain collaboration is defined as “a relationship between supply chain partners developed over a period of time”. But to understand the concept of collaboration it has to be distinguished from cooperation and coordination.

Cooperation involves little risk and doesn’t require too much involvement from the company’s point of view. With cooperation, contracts of longer duration are developed with suppliers than would normally be the case in open market negotiations, but companies still operate separately from each other with no clearly defined mission.
(Mangan et al. 2008; Winer & Ray 1994). Still cooperation differs from pure market negotiations, since it contains information sharing and ‘being a good neighbor’ (DIT, 2009:27). The information sharing is still limited and resources are held separately (Winer & Ray 1994).

Coordination is the next step from cooperation, towards collaboration. In coordination, some sharing of resources and systems occur (DIT 2009). The relationships among the coordinating parties is more formal than in cooperation, since the parties share a common mission and focus on mutually agreed goals. Coordination leads to relationship building, which can lead to improved performance (McLachlin & Larsen 2011). Coordination involves somewhat more risk that cooperation, since resources and rewards are shared (Winer & Ray 1994).

### 2.3.1. Collaboration

Collaboration, emerging from coordination, is, based on mutual benefits for the whole supply chain. In a collaborative relationship the participants have to share information and have a common goal for the activities as well as resource sharing. This will require or lead to some level of both internal and external integration. A collaborative relationship is long-term oriented, includes comprehensive planning and interdependency between parties and leads to results through a new structure. The authority or power is determined by the structure of the collaborative supply chain. Power or authority can be a primary issue in collaboration. (Winer & Ray 1994) McLachlin and Larsen (2011:34) conceptualize the collaborative relationships through the following inter-related elements:

- Information sharing
- Goal congruence
- Decision synchronization
- Incentive alignment
- Resource sharing
- Collaborative communication
- Joint knowledge creation
Collaboration, even more than coordination, is relationship oriented and requires internal and external integration. Therefore a collaborative relationship takes time to develop. Collaboration can happen both externally and internally in a firm. (Mangan et al. 2008)

Collaboration has two dimensions: vertical and horizontal. From a company perspective these dimensions are also divided into internal and external collaboration. Vertical collaboration takes place between suppliers and customers while horizontal collaboration takes place between competitors and other actors in the supply chain. Vertical collaboration is easier to achieve and thus more common than horizontal collaboration. It is claimed that substantial benefits can be achieved if a supply network is able to implement both kinds of collaboration (Mangan et al. 2008:254). There is a potential danger in this context that lies in organizations trying to pursue external collaboration without even considering internal collaboration (Barrat 2004:32). Internal collaboration should not be overseen, since it can strengthen the organization from within and enable internal integration. Still only a few companies have achieved complete internal integration. External collaboration should then be developed as a parallel process through integrating processes and sharing information with customers and suppliers as well as creating a closer relationship with all supply chain parties (Barrat 2004:31-33).

2.3.1.1. Integration

Integration is a process and a prerequisite for, as well as a result of, successful collaboration. Integration should not be seen as a further step away from collaboration, but as a process that develops through the evolvement of a relationship from open market negotiations to collaboration. Integration can be both internal and external. Internal integration is needed in order to connect the activities and departments inside an organization, for example fill the knowledge gap between demand and supply activities. But it is important to remember that internal integration is not enough and should be carried out together with external integration. External integration is cross-functional integration and can happen through backward integration with first and possibly second tier suppliers, or through forward integration with first tier customers or service providers. The integration process goes hand in hand with SC collaboration, but here it is important to note that while integration is process and product oriented, collaboration is relationship oriented. (Mangan et al. 2008)
2.4. Collaborative Supply Chain Partnerships

The partnership approach in supply chain management is, according to Hieber (2002:80) one of the most important parts of collaboration. A partnership is a “closely integrated, mutually beneficial relationship that enhances supply chain performance”. The key point in a partnership is that it is a customized supply chain relationship based on openness and trust, and risk and reward sharing that leads to better performance than the partnership parties would have achieved without the partnership. (Lambert et al. 2004:22) Relationships and partnerships in the supply chain do enhance performance and satisfaction and this leads to even closer relationship building, so it can be concluded that collaborative activities in the supply chain lead to both commitment and trust among SC actors (MCLachlin & Larson 2011).

When discussing partnerships it is important to bear in mind that partnerships require investments in extra communication and risk sharing, which might be costly. Supply chain partnerships aren’t supplier-selection tools. This is why a partnership should be established only if there actually is a need and proper benefits can be achieved through it. When considering partnership options, distinctions between low- and high-value partnerships can be made, for example considering complexity and volumes of bought goods from suppliers or other factors strategically important for the company. If all factors are “high” there might be a need for seeking a partnership. This is one way of ensuring value delivery from the partnership, since no unnecessary partnerships are entered into. Even though a partnership might be needed, failure can still occur if the parties haven’t stated their expectations for the partnership clearly at the outset. (Lambert & Knemeyer 2004) Whipple and Russell (2007) present three types of collaborative supply chain relationships:

- *Transaction-oriented relationships* work primarily on solving problems and developing immediate solutions by focusing on issues and tasks. For example dealing with late deliveries etc.;

- *Event-oriented relationships* that focus on critical issues and events through joint planning and decision making. A critical event can be for example to find bottlenecks and disruptions in the supply chain;

- *Process-oriented relationships* are more long-term oriented and include fully integrated supply chain processes across different functions and organizations, and joint business planning. So the process-oriented relationships are more strategic in nature and covers both downstream demand and upstream processes
According to McLachlin and Larson (2011), this typology can also be adapted to the humanitarian relief operations context. Similarly Lee (2008) concludes that business and community can benefit from creating partnerships to tackle, for example, social issues. Lee (2008) explains business-community partnerships through the collective purpose they have that is realized through synergy, addressing an chosen issue together and by sustaining interaction among parties. The instrumental purpose, on the other hand, is the mutual benefits that the parties in a business-community partnership can gain. Business can build on its reputation, engage further with stakeholders and increase employee satisfaction, whilst a community organization can access resources, build brand recognition and enhance its credibility. The facilitators behind the partnership are crucial and some fundamental factors behind partnership building are (McLachlin & Larson 2011:35):

- The corporate cultures must be compatible
- The managerial techniques and philosophies must be compatible
- There should be a strong sense of mutuality
- The partners should be symmetric

When these facilitators are in place the partnership has a high potential of becoming a “win-win” collaboration where both parties can benefit (Lee 2008).

2.4.1. Evaluation of Supply Chain Partnerships

Performance measurement and evaluation of partnerships can be done in several ways. It can be process-oriented, scope-oriented, based on hierarchies and organizational levels or be a systematic model-oriented approach. Model-oriented approaches have the strength of providing a “tool-box” to ease the performance measurement through clear stages or steps. The hierarchical approach concerns the different levels and departments inside an organization and is focused on the strategic and tactical as well as operational context of the tasks that these levels perform. (Hieber 2002:84) In this thesis the aim is to create a framework for evaluation of corporate-humanitarian partnerships, so the evaluation of partnerships will be mainly model oriented (as a framework is developed), but also somewhat hierarchical, since it concerns capability evaluation through for example hierarchies earlier presented (Grant 2010).
The results-related objectives of a partnership will depend on what level of supply chain coordination or collaboration the partnership is trying to achieve. The performance areas can be related to efficiency or transformability/flexibility in the supply chain. The measurement of these outcomes will determine the specific performance measurement chosen for the partnership. (Hieber 2002.)

Partnership evaluation has to consider the level and degree of information sharing as well as the scope of engagement of partnership parties. There can be a financial or non-financial approach for performance measurement of partnerships and usually a balance-oriented approach, in which both perspectives are included, is important also. The financial measurements mostly consider the cash flow. The non-financial measurements, on the other hand, include competency development, skills and capability in for example supply-chain based problem solving, information exchange channels, and new concepts. (Hieber 2002:81.) In this thesis the focus, according to the aim, lies on the non-financial measurement of partnerships.

Hieber (2002:107) proposes the following stages to be included in the measurement of collaborative supply chain efforts. These steps are flexible and can be adapted to different settings.

1) **Phase of initialization and configuration for the supply chain**: In this stage the common drivers are stated and a common strategy is agreed upon. The whole scope has to be presented and the goals have to be set as well as defining milestones;

2) **Phase of supply chain analysis**: The features related to coordination, cooperation and collaboration have to be reviewed. The critical areas of the supply chain have to be identified and the enablers of the process must be identified;

3) **Phase of supply chain improvements**: Here the information flow has to be considered and the responsibilities have to be defined. IT-support has to be made clear and developed. A detailed action plan has to be in place and training as well as realization must take place.

4) **Phase of supply chain performance measurement**: Here the aggregated results have to be reviewed and specified. Performance analysis has to take place as well as reporting so that essential changes can happen. Performance reviews take place in the individual organizations, for example on a quarterly basis. For example a supply chain scorecard can be used for this.

Lambert et al. (2004:23) present a model (figure 6) that can be useful for building and evaluating partnerships. The drivers, meaning the reasons to engage in a partnership, are of four different types: assets and cost efficiencies, marketing advantages, better customer service, and stability or profit growth. If a partnership is not working out
properly the parties can, for example, examine if the drivers or facilitators have changed, or if the outcomes are different than expected due to changed components. (Lambert & Knemeyer 2004) This model will later be used for the development of the framework that this thesis aims to create and the measurement phases initiated by Hieber (2002) will also be considered in the model.

![The Partnership Model](image)

**Figure 6  The Partnership Model (Lambert et al. 2004:23)**

### 2.4.2. Building Corporate-humanitarian Partnerships

Collaboration through partnerships can play a very important role in tackling social issues (Lee 2008). Van Wassenhove (2006:475) states that “private sector logistics can and should be applied to improve the performance of disaster logistics” and that there are several cross-learning possibilities for humanitarians and businesses. Van Wassenhove (2006) gives an example of the partnership between the World Food Program (WFP) and the logistics provider TNT. In this case both parties acquired benefits from the partnership. For example TNT got free positive publicity creating a better reputation and gaining customer loyalty as well as knowledge from working in a supply chain characterized by high uncertainty, giving the employees better skills in working with challenging situations. The humanitarian actors can benefit from the partnership by learning better preparedness –Specifically via back-office support - and getting assistance with moving key assets such as food and medicines during a crisis situation (Tomasini & Van Wassenhove 2009:557). So these kinds of partnerships that McLachlin and Larson (2011) would call “humoneytarian” support the statement by
Thomas and Fritz (2006:122) that “maintaining a commitment to systemic improvement between disasters will reduce suffering far more than a philanthropic donation made after the fact”.

The key to success of corporate-humanitarian partnerships is the integration of its precepts at all levels of both organizations. Decisions taken at the top level must be done in consideration of the reality on the ground (Van Wassenhove et al. 2008:4).

It is important to note, however, that bad communication as well as a lack of governance can cause obstacles. It is very important to clearly define mutual goals as well as define the length of the partnership, since both parties most likely have different underlying agendas. It is of utmost importance to align corporate goals with the ambitions of the humanitarian organizations. In addition to defining the duration of the partnership, a funding timetable, and spending guidelines should be decided upon. An exit strategy should also be in place, so that the partnership can end in case of it failing. Instead of duplicating efforts, the partnership should complement the parties’ strengths. However, it should be noted that skepticism still seems to be a barrier for corporate-humanitarian partnerships. To avoid this, capacity and trust building should be established between and before disasters strike. This can be hard because of the differences between the two sectors. Humanitarian organizations tend to, have slow bureaucratic decision-making processes, especially during non-disaster times, whereas corporations can be more flexible. (Van Wassenhove et al. 2008.)

2.4.2.1. Benefits of Corporate-humanitarian Partnerships

“The exchange of value for mutual benefit represents the essence of the [corporate-humanitarian] partnership” (Maon et al. 2009:9). There are three main supply chain management related dimensions in which greater corporate-humanitarian collaboration could be in place: resource related issues, information technology and infrastructure and strategic issues. At the moment there is still limited collaboration and coordination between corporate and humanitarian actors in the relief network and in all the disaster management phases there are resource related problems. Furthermore, information flow and management is an issue where these types of relationships could be useful. (Maon et al. 2009) Tomasini and Van Wassenhove (2009:557) claims that successful private-humanitarian partnerships can become “learning laboratories for both parties”. For the business party in a collaborative partnership the reasons for the partnership are both ethical, addressing a social issue, and strategic (Lee 2008:37).
The motivation for the corporate partner when choosing issues for partnerships is usually based on strategic questions that concern or support the core mission of the company and the non-profit partner usually acknowledges the fact that it can benefit significantly from collaboration with a business partner. For the business, the collaboration with the humanitarian partner would be in the scope of the company’s CSR activities. This collaboration would benefit the given what it is possible to learn about flexibility, rapid response and agility in the humanitarian supply chain. Collaboration can also lead to a speed up in the recovery of the region, which can enhance the business in the disaster region itself, since a disaster negatively affects economic performance and productivity. A business can also earn a license to operate in developing local markets through collaboration with a humanitarian actor. In addition to these operational benefits a company can achieve better reputation. (Maon et al. 2009:157-158.)

A successful partnership has several potential benefits, such as, fast delivery and effective support during a disaster. It can aid capacity building before and after disasters and the partnership can facilitate the exchange of good ideas and best practices that benefit both parties. But in order to create these kinds of benefits, the expertise and needs of both the corporations and the humanitarian organizations must be aligned. (Van Wassenhove et al. 2008.)

2.4.2.2. Different kinds of Cross-sector partnerships

There is an increasing amount of cross-sector socially oriented collaboration, explicitly with the aim of addressing a social issue. In these kind of scenarios private corporations have begun to go beyond solely monetary contribution and have started to contribute other resources as well (Maon et al. 2009). “Transactional” projects of this nature, characterized as constrained, short-term, and largely self-interest–oriented, differ from “integrative” or developmental projects, which are open-ended, longer-term, and largely common-interest–oriented (Selsky & Parker 2005:850). There are several ways of distinguishing different kinds of partnerships. Selsky and Parker (2005:849) discuss what they call CCSPs (project-based cross-sector partnerships to address social issues) and conclude that the main four areas where these types of partnerships occur are:

- Business-nonprofit
- Business-government
Thomas and Fritz (2006:120-121), on the other hand, present four main types of disaster-relief agency-private corporation partnerships:

- Single organization philanthropic partnerships;
- Multiple organization philanthropic partnerships for example a disaster relief network;
- Single-organization integrative partnerships for example the World Food Program and TNT;
- Multiple organization integrative partnerships.

Another division into relationship types in the humanitarian sector is made by McLachlin and Larson (2011:38):

- Humanitarian relationships - between NGO’s;
- Humilitarian relationships – between an NGO and (National) military;
- HumanitarUN relationships – between an NGO and an UN agency;
- Humoneyitarian relationships – between an NGO and a commercial firm.

In addition to this McLachlin and Larson (2011:38) also mention NGO’s relationships with government agencies and local community groups. When corporate-humanitarian partnerships are spoken further about they are classified as the humoneyitarian (McLachlin and Larson, 2011), business-nonprofit partnerships aiming at either integrative or transactional projects (Selsky & Parker 2005).

2.5. **A Theoretical Framework for Building Corporate-humanitarian Relationships**

In this section the theory presented in this chapter will be summarized and presented in a framework to be used for the purpose of this study corporate-humanitarian partnerships building from a resource-based view perspective. The framework (figure 7) is simplified in many ways, making it adaptable to many different situations. The framework stages, presented visually in figure 7, will be discussed and explained below. The framework is an adapted model of the earlier presented partnership framework in figure 6 (Lambert et al. 2004). The evaluation criteria discussed by Hieber (2002) have
also been considered when creating the model. The model has been changed so as to contain and focus on the RBV elements. Figure 7 presents the model as cyclical, because there should be a possibility for reflection. The model will be tested in the empirical part of the study.

**Figure 7** A framework for building corporate-humanitarian partnerships

### 2.5.1. Step 1: Facilitators and Drivers of the Partnership

The drivers of the partnership are the causes and the motivation for a corporation to engage in a partnership and facilitators are the circumstances and the supporting external factors that make the partnership possible (Lambert et al. 2004). Compatibility of corporate cultures and management styles as well as a strong sense of mutuality would be facilitators that need to be in place (McLachlin & Larson 2011). Facilitators also include the existing capabilities of each party in the partnership.

The drivers for the partnership also dictate the outcome targets, so the drivers need to be clear at the outset (Lambert et al. 2004). The corporation would then need to outline...
what kind of targets and issues require collaboration in the partnership. Will the issues be resource related, related to information technology, infrastructure, or to strategy? The drivers of the partnership could be the potential benefits from a partnership, such as general collaboration benefits (Barrat 2004).

2.5.2. Step 2: Decision to Engage in a Partnership

According to Lambert et al. (2004) this is the step where the corporation should decide on whether to engage in partnership or not. Here it is still possible to adjust the partnership. For example, people related issues, technology and measurement should be settled and of course the expectations, set by the drivers in step one, should be discussed in order for the common goals to be set. At this stage the partners should also decide upon what type of partnership it is: transaction-oriented, event-oriented, or process-oriented (Whipple & Russell 2007).

2.5.3. Step 3: The Components i.e. Joint Activities of the Partnership

This is the stage where the existing resources and capabilities are tested and new ones occur through partnership synergies. If the facilitators are in place the partnership should be a win-win collaboration (Lee 2008). If the first two steps are not in place it will show at this stage. The joint activities can be for example related to supply chain activities or other capacity activities. This step depends highly on the aim and function of the partnership, determined in step one and two. Here we also have to note that the capabilities of a firm are the outcomes of the internal routines and processes (Grant 2010) so the outcomes will be strongly related to the joint activities performed in step 3. In the case of humanitarian aid, this step has to consider the different phases in disaster relief operations: Preparedness, emergency response, reconstruction and mitigation (Maon et al. 2009). Since the corporate-humanitarian partnership activities could occur in one or several of the stages.

2.5.4. Step 4: Outcomes

Outcomes is about the extent to which there is mutual benefit in the partnership and how well the performance of the partnership meets the expectations set by the drivers of the partnership.
In this step it is possible to see if the partnership has created any capabilities or resources that actually pose a strategic benefit to the company. In order to get a more long-term perspective on the benefits achieved the resources must be evaluated to establish whether any valuable supply chain linkages have been created in the partnership? As Rungtusanatham et al. 2003 conclude, the linkages and the knowledge and information they provide are resources themselves. Together with the other capabilities of the firm, such as the whole supply chain management, the firm can refine a valuable capability in the partnership. Here the knowledge-acquisition capability is in focus (Fawcett 2008b). The potential capabilities acquired also have to be related to the firm’s overall capabilities to establish if any strategic benefits have been achieved. This can be done through classifying capabilities, for example with Grant’s (2010) hierarchical model. To ease the process of understanding the resources and the capabilities the VRIN quality of a resource (Barney 1991) is also worth bearing in mind.

2.5.5. Step 5: Re-evaluation of the Process and the Partnership

In this stage the results of the evaluation and performance measurement have to be considered; this is the stage at which the process and the partnership should be re-evaluated. If strategic benefits can be derived from the partnership it has been successful and if not, there is an urgent need to reconsider both the facilitators and the drivers of the partnership, since not all partnerships are needed nor are all successful (Lamnert et al. 2004). Therefore an exit strategy for both parties should be in place (Van Wassenhove et al. 2008). Performance measurement as presented by, for example Hieber (2002), should also be present in this step.
3 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter presents the research methods chosen for this study and explains the choices behind the methods, linking them to the aim and the research questions of the study. The chapter starts with outlining the authors’ basic understanding of the philosophy of science and research approach and continues with a presentation and discussion about the chosen methods. In the last part of the chapter research quality will be discussed and the quality criteria for this study will be presented.

3.1. Philosophy of Science

Positivism has been the major research approach in logistics and supply chain management (Kovács and Spens 2007c), but it has been shown that other approaches can also provide useful tools for logistics research (Halldórsson & Aastrup 2003). Even though positivism would not be the base for research there are still a multitude of options for philosophy of science. “Naturalism focuses on the factual characteristics of the object under study” (Silverman 2010:105) when the study of phenomenon; the structures of experience and appearance of things, is phenomenology (Smith 2011). As Kovács and Spens (2007c) point out, there are several options for categorising research paradigms. Concluding, Kovács and Spens (2007c) make a division between positivism, scientific realism, and interpretivism.

Scientific realism has often been used as an umbrella term for different approaches, but what is interesting with this approach is its position in-between interpretivism and positivism. Where positivism speaks for an absolute truth and interpretivism refutes the idea of an absolute truth scientific realism stays in the middle ground. (Kovács & Spens 2007c)

Scientific realism, does not, indeed, refute the ideas of truth and falsity (that would be scepticism) just replaces the notion of 'absolute truth' with that of a contextualized 'approximate' or 'relative truth' (Kovács & Spens 2007c:11).

Philosophically realism stands for the belief that the world exists independently even without our knowledge about it, so the concepts we talk about in for example management, do reflect something that exists in the real world (Fisher 2007:276). Still the context is very important, since knowledge is contextualised and interpreted in context. Therefore also problems should be solved in context. (Kovács and Spens 2007c)
Since I believe, that results can be presented so that they appear as ‘true’ in context, the scientific realist approach is a suitable philosophical stance for this study. The scientific realist approach also, contrary to a positivistic approach, makes possible a qualitative method for conducting research.

3.2. Research Approach

There is no consensus concerning the classification of qualitative research approaches (Patton 2002:131), but generally qualitative approaches can be divided in accordance with studying the processes (how something is constructed) or the substance (what is being studied) (Silverman 2010:104). This is a deductive study, since it as Patton (2002) explains, begins with a theoretical framework and hypothesis that is then tested through an empirical study in order to analyse and confirm the results. For deduction to be suitable, a proper operationalization of the phenomena studied needs to be carried out. To be able to draw general conclusions, the propositions or hypothesis in the thesis need to be tested empirically in order to either verify or falsify them. (Kovács & Spens 2007c) This study begins with a general approach that is then concluded with more specific research results.

3.3. Why Qualitative Research Methods?

Qualitative research methods are useful for finding patterns and themes, understanding phenomena and getting insight in different issues. Qualitative data can be collected mainly in three different ways: through open-ended, in-depth interviews, direct observation and from written documents. This study is aiming at deeper understanding and insight on an issue, so qualitative research methods are proposed by the literature to be useful in these types of research. (Patton 2002)

3.3.1. Case Studies

One important advantage of case studies is that a case study gives the opportunity for the researcher to get a holistic and encompassing picture of one case (Gummesson 2000). Case studies that are well done are holistic and consider the context of the case. A case study can also be analysed in several layers (Patton 2002:447). The aim of a case study can be either to draw general conclusions or to draw specific conclusions based on a restricted case. A case study is very well suited for studying contemporary events
that the researcher has no control over. In addition, a case study answers well to questions like “how” and “why.” (Yin 2003:9)

The essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions: why they were taken, how they were implemented, and with what result (Yin 2003:12).

Since this study aims to achieve a deeper understanding about partnership building in humanitarian logistics, a case study is a very relevant choice of method, since it can provide the insights necessary to answer the research questions set as 'how' questions. The quote by Yin (2003:12) also illuminates the possibilities of a case study as a research method for uncovering the partnership building process and the decisions and needs of the case company in trying to build successful corporate-humanitarian partnerships.

The aim will influence the sampling for the case study. Case studies can be classified according to three categories: explorative, descriptive and explaining (Gummesson 2000:85). In addition to this Baxter and Jack (2008) mention multiple-case, intrinsic, instrumental, and collective case studies as case study types. In all types it is important to create a research process that is easy for the reader to follow. The results from a successful case study make it possible to generalize for a larger field (Eisenhardt 1989). A single case with embedded units gives and opportunity of understanding a unique and Critical case (Baxter & Jack 2008). This thesis is based on an exploratory case study on the company Peepoople. The exploratory view relies in the aim of this thesis. Through several explorative elements a deeper understanding of the issue, as is stated in the thesis aim, can be achieved. The results from the case study can be used for increasing the understanding of partnership-building in the humanitarian relief context.

3.3.2. Sample

In the sampling phase the units of analysis have to be considered. The units of analysis state the size and type of sample for the study. The units of analysis can be for example individuals, groups or organizations. (Patton 2002) When planning the sample it is of utmost importance to consider how the research questions and the aim of the study is formulated (Patton 2002; Silverman, 2006). In the sample the proposed depth and width or coverage of the study has to be considered, since it might be a question about a trade-off in between these. In order to make an efficient analysis it is though necessary
to have a limited amount of data to work with. (Patton, 2002) This is also why the sample is so critical and why the researcher has to consider how accessible the data is, what kind of pre-understanding he/she has for the data and the type of quality the data represents (Gummesson 2000). Case studies in themselves are entities of analysis and the result of the research process is the case study in itself. Therefore the primary unit of analysis in this study will be the case company Peepoople.

In qualitative studies the aim of the sampling method is to gain a sample that is purposeful and rich in information. There are several sampling strategies for purposeful sampling. (Patton, 2002) In this study a purposeful sampling method is going to be used. When considering case studies it is important to remember that the choice of case i.e. sampling, will affect the generalizability of the results and will affect the possibilities to develop theory from a case study. A case can be chosen so that it corresponds to earlier case studies and theories or develops the theory that is in the making. Cases can also be chosen so that they meet pre-defined theoretical criteria and function as opposites of each other. (Eisenhardt 1989)

In this study criterion sampling as well as critical case sampling has been used. The case company Peepoople have been chosen, because it fills the criteria put forward to be able to answer the research questions. Peepoople is a corporation that seeks to develop partnerships with humanitarian actors. Since the company is in a very early stage of the partnership building process, the case can give valuable insights on this issue. What makes the case company special is that it operates mostly in the emergency sector, which will make its partnerships with humanitarians slightly different in focus, from those partnerships that are built from a corporate CSR perspective. This aspect of the case company also makes it a critical or extreme case that can give additional and valuable information about the general issue.

### 3.3.3. Interviews

The idea behind using interviews in research studies is that the researcher engages in a somewhat informal discussion with the respondent, in order to get his or her opinions on a particular matter. Especially in explanatory research, the interview techniques are in-depth and open-ended. Survey research interviews on the other hand, are strongly controlled by the researcher and this gives little flexibility for how the interview turns out. A third option is to conduct a so called semi-structured interview. In this type of interview the researcher has a pre-defined schedule and questions about the topic, but
there is flexibility, such as additional follow-up questions. For an interview to be successful it will need to be well structured and planned. (Fisher 2010)

An interview guide will be used to ensure that all relevant themes are discussed during the interview. An interview guide also gives the different interviews the structure required in order to be able to effectively compare interviews with each other. The general possibilities for interviews are structured, semi-structured, open-ended and focus group interviews. (Patton 2002; Silverman 2006) The types of questions used in an interview are also essential for the results and information gained. All questions can be asked in several different ways and asking a question in different ways can help the researcher gain the correct information and clarify the question. It is the researcher who is responsible for ensuring the interviewee understands the questions asked. There are six general categories of questions: Opinion and value questions, feeling questions, knowledge questions, sensory questions, and background/demographic questions. Keeping these question types in mind will ease the interview planning process (Patton 2002). Different interview methods can be used in order to gain the information needed (Patton 2002; Silverman 2006), but it is important to remember that the interviewees in themselves don’t give direct access to a phenomena, but rather a representation of the information. This has to be considered in the analysis of interviews (Silverman 2006).

In this study the material has be gathered through semi-structured interviews. This was done, because a semi-structured interview gives the possibility of steering the flow of the interview, but allows some flexibility in the interview situation. The interview guide was created on the basis of the steps present in the theoretical framework (figure 7) and the interview questions were divided into main questions and prompting questions. The main questions were all answered and the prompting questions were asked if needed.

Open-access company material such as the Peepoople company website was reviewed before the interview guideline was planned, so that the interview guideline would contain relevant questions. The division of the interview guideline according to the theoretical framework made it possible to focus the interview questions in accordance with the area about which the respondent had most knowledge and insight in. Therefore all the questions weren’t asked of all respondents, but all the main questions were answered by the person most knowledgeable in that area. The interview guide for this study is presented in appendix 3 and a table of Peepoople company respondents
can be found in appendix 1. The interviews were conducted in and transcribed to Swedish.

### 3.3.4. Usage of Company Internal Data

Secondary data is both qualitative and quantitative data that has been compiled for a specific purpose. Secondary data can be both raw data and compiled data and most organizations collect secondary data such as for example company reports. Secondary data can be useful in descriptive and explanatory research and is used as supporting material in a study. Secondary data can be documentary data, survey-based data or data compiled from several sources. (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill 2009)

Triangulation is the process of comparing and using different kinds of data or different methods in a study (Silveman 2006). Triangulation can be done to arrive at data that is as meaningful as possible, since all methods have limitations (Patton 2002). In this study secondary data in the form of internal company data such as strategic plans and other information material provided by Peepoople has been used to support the interviews and later in the analysis. The company internal data used is presented in appendix 2.

### 3.4. Analysing Qualitative Data

Silverman (2006) proposes four initial steps for analysis of qualitative data: data reduction, data development, conclusions, and confirmation. In the first step the raw data is dealt with in order to be able to know on which parts to focus. In the second step the data is organized in for example tables, so that it is possible to draw some conclusions from it. In the conclusions part the focus is on finding possible patterns and explanations in the data. After this it is time to step back to relate these conclusions to theory and to discuss the quality of the findings. When analysing qualitative interview data some elements of thematic analysis can be used in the organization of the data, so that the data is structured according to the themes that occur during the interviews. This will make categorization and classification easier, and therefore give structure to the conclusions. (Silverman 2006)

The basic structure of the analysis that Silverman (2006) suggests is in accordance with the structure of template even called thematic, analysis. If the researcher wishes to take into consideration more context specific elements and use an analysis technique that is
adaptable to the specific research requirements, template analysis can be used (Cassell & Symon 2004:257).

Ideally, [thematic analysis] it is able to offer the systematic element characteristic of content analysis, but also permits the researcher to combine analysis of the frequency of codes with analysis of their meaning in context, this adding the advantage of the subtlety and complexity of a truly qualitative analysis (Marks and Yardley 2004:57).

In template or thematic analysis pattern recognition is done in the raw data (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane 2006). The researcher identifies main “master themes” and their subsidiary themes. These higher and lower-order themes can then be balanced between and across in a case analysis. The identification can be done through coding the data for example through labelling key features in text segments and then cluster together similar codes to form higher-order codes. (Cassell & Symon 2004) In template analysis the terms code and theme are often used interchangeably (Marks & Yardley 2004). The broader categories of codes or themes can help the researcher gain a general picture about for example an interview, while lower order codes or themes allow the researcher to make fine distinctions and study details. The coding strategies in template analysis therefore enable an analysis on varying levels of a text. (Cassell & Symon 2004:258)

Important to note in the coding process is that the researcher has to “see” an important moment in the data as well as code it i.e. “see it as something”. Still this is done before the actual interpretation of the material is done (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane 2006:83). Waring and Wainwright (2008:86) put forward the following procedure for conducting template analysis:

- Create a code manual or a coding scheme; the codes can be pre-defined based on the theoretical framework of the research or developed after an initial run-through of the data. This two coding strategies can also be combined
- Code the text by hand or with computer
- Sort the text so that all similar text is in one place
- Read the segments and make connections. The connections have to be legitimised and corroborated

The coding strategies as presented by Waring and Wainwright (2008:86) are what Marks and Yardley (2004:57) would call deductive coding or inductive coding, where deductive coding refers to theoretical information that is brought into the data, whereas inductive coding refers to codes that derive from the raw data itself.
Template analysis provides a structural way of for analysing material on the basis of existing theme categories at the same time as it is a good tool for analysing the meaning of data in a context, and therefore it has been used as the analysis tool in this thesis. In the initial stage of the template analysis a combination of pre-coding on the basis of the theoretical framework (deductive coding) and coding on the basis of the material (inductive coding) has been done in order to capture the whole context and give an encompassing picture of the interview material.

As Patton (2002) concludes, one advantage with qualitative research methods is the possibility to start analysing the empirical data in an early stage of the study. Therefore the analytical process goes through the data collection process as well as the analysis process. In this study the initial analysis started already after the first interviews were done, when the author wrote down the first impressions about the data and the information. The analysis process was then supported by going through the analysis data while transcribing and the conducting a structured analysis. The interview data from the four interviews conducted the 15th of February in Stockholm at the Peepoople office was done with the support of the interview guideline (appendix 3) and was recorded and transcribed. The interview data analysis was conducted through the analysis of the transcribed material. The data was analysed due to template analysis as presented by Cassell and Symon (2004) as well as Waring and Wainwright (2008).

- First, the interview data was categorized into main themes in accordance with the theoretical framework steps that functioned as main coding categories.
- In addition, some codes were added after the initial run-through of the data. These codes were added to the scheme based on themes that emerged during the interviews.
- Secondly, the themes were organized into subsidiary themes and these were then linked with the major themes.
- The coding was done by hand and similar text was compiled in a table to enable further analysis.
- Analysis was conducted and connections were made to existing theory.

3.5. Measuring Research Quality Through Trustworthiness

In qualitative research it is of utmost importance to critically examine the study results and the courses of action to obtain the results to be able to determine the quality and authenticity of the study (Silverman 2006). The notion of trustworthiness as quality
criteria is important in qualitative studies. Trustworthiness has three main components: truth value, application, and external judgment and neutrality of findings. The truth value has to be shown through some measure of credibility. The study must also communicate the possibilities for application of the results by the intended audience. In addition to this the audience must have the possibility to check the findings and the research process. Trustworthiness can also be judged based on four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. (Halldórsson & Astrup, 2003:326) These judgment criteria are presented as complements for research quality evaluation especially in the area of logistics, since the logistics research field has been dominated by quantitative and positivist criteria. These quality criteria are presented as suitable for more naturalistic types of inquiry like qualitative interviews. (Halldórsson & Astrup, 2003:321) The quality criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability will be used as quality measurement criteria in this study, since they are suitable for judging quality of qualitative logistics studies.

### 3.5.1. Credibility

Credibility is a measure of the truth-value in the study. Halldórsson and Aastrup (2003) point out that credibility is comparable to the notion of internal validity. It is important to note that “the respondents themselves play a central role in falsifying/correcting the picture of reality drawn by the researcher”, since what determines credibility is how the respondents view on the topic matches with the researchers representation of it. Therefore credibility has to do with how well the results of the study correspond with the reality it is studying. (Halldórsson and Aastrup 2003:327.)

### 3.5.2. Transferability

Transferability as a quality criterion is understood as the generalizability of the study findings i.e. how well one can make general claims on the basis of the study. Transferability can be compared to external validity. When transferability is discussed, it is important to consider that both time and space can limit the generalizability of the study findings. (Halldórsson and Aastrup 2003:327.)
3.5.3. Dependability

Dependability can be compared to reliability as a quality criterion, since it concerns “the stability of data over time”. Important in dependability is the “trackability” in the study and through documenting the research process and methodology, decisions about dependability can be achieved. (Halldórsson and Aastrup 2003:328.)

3.5.4. Confirmability

Confirmability is parallel to the quality criterion of objectivity. This criterion concerns the study findings and whether or not the findings represent the results and not the values or biases of the researcher. In a naturalistic methodology setting the point of “how well the findings can be confirmed through the data itself” is emphasized. This can be done by making the processes used to achieve the results transparent so that external parties can guarantee the confirmability of the findings. (Halldórsson and Aastrup 2003:328.)

3.5.5. The Trustworthiness of the Study

To enhance the trustworthiness of the study before the empirical part was conducted, the research process has thoroughly been explained and discussed in this thesis in order for the audience to be able to understand the process and check the findings. All theoretical data has been collected from academic sources and there is a possibility for an outsider to check the information with the case company, since the case company information is stated in the thesis reference information. This enhances the dependability and confirmability of the study. For transferability to be present the theoretical framework was first constructed on the basis of existing literature and theory. To ensure credibility of the empirical data the interview guideline as well as an explanation of the study was sent out to the case company on beforehand, so that they would be aware of the research scope. As concluded earlier, credibility can also be improved through a template in template analysis, which makes a clear “trail” of evidence for the credibility of the study.
4  PEEPOOPLE’S PARTNERSHIP BUILDING WITH HUMANITARIAN ACTORS

In this chapter the empirical data will be presented and analysed. The chapter willl start by presenting the special issue area wherein the case company Peepoople operates (water and sanitation) and thereafter the case company as well as structure and business model will be presented. After this the actual analysis will be presented in accordance with the structure of the theoretical framework and the steps presented in it.

4.1.  How the Data Analysis Was Conducted

Table 4 sets out the categorization of the most frequent theme categories in the interviews, the respondents that have mentioned the theme, or where certain themes have been discussed. This analysis has been done through the template analysis elements presented in the methodology chapter. Table 4 is a compilation of the coding process and the coding table that was done with the transcribed interview data. A combination of deductive and inductive coding was used. The framework step in which the topic is important is also mentioned in the table. Inductive coding was used for emerging themes, such as understanding the customer, which occurred as new during the interviews in the sense that they were not stated in the interview guideline (appendix 3). The interview guideline had been sent out on beforehand to the company contact person Kristian Hansson.
Table 3  Table with themes discussed with the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most important theme categories based on framework (deductive coding)</th>
<th>Theme most important in step</th>
<th>Anders Wilhelmson</th>
<th>Kristian Hansson</th>
<th>Karin Ruiz</th>
<th>Maria Berndtsson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive advantage</td>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands on partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot try experiences</td>
<td>5, 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/goal setting</td>
<td>1, 4, 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business model and funding</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views on partnership</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who to partner with?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What activities does the NGO do?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peepoole’s responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness phase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery phase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution/logistics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and knowledge</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational planning</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths and capabilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to gain from partnership</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most important themes categories that emerged during interviews (inductive coding)**

| Importance to understand customer organization                       | 1, 2, 3                       | x                 | x                |            |                  |
| Perception about humanitarian organizations                          | 1, 2                          | x                 | x                | x          | x                |
| Problems with sanitation solutions today                             | 1, 2                          | x                 | x                | x          | x                |
| Discussion about the product itself (functionality)                  | 1, 3                          | x                 | x                | x          | x                |
4.2. Water and Sanitation Issues in Humanitarian Logistics

There is a big gap between rich and poor populations when it comes to health. This is mainly because of differential access to drugs as well as to sanitation and clean water. Clean water and sanitation is a crucial issue, given that through water many diseases are transmitted. (Widdus 2001) The linkages between poverty and water and sanitation are presented in figure 8.

Approximately 1.3 billion people in the developing world lack access to adequate quantities of clean water, and nearly 3 billion people are without adequate means of disposing of their feces. An estimated 10,000 people die every day from water- and sanitation-related diseases, and thousands more suffer from a range of debilitating illnesses (Bosch et al 2002:373).

![Figure 8: The Linkage between Poverty and Water and Sanitation (from Bosch et al. 2002:373)](image)

Natural hazards have direct and indirect effects on public health and the health care system. (Shoaf & Rottman 2000:58) Some of the main challenges to ensure women and girls can access healthcare are conflicts and displacement of some kind. Women and girls are also extra vulnerable in camp situations (UNHCR 2008:267). Disasters increase the risk of outbreaks of infectious diseases and the circumstances following a disaster usually lead to an increased potential for disease transmission. The most common cause of diseases spreading is fecal contamination of water and food. These diseases tend to be enteric and the risk of epidemic outbreaks correlates strongly with the displacement and proportional population density. The consequences for the existing water and sanitation infrastructure will affect the situation. From an infrastructure perspective sewerage systems and drinking water supplies especially are very vulnerable to natural hazards and disruptions. The effects on these systems will
have a big impact on the population, since the systems are usually extensive. Environmental factors such as heavy rain and floods can worsen the situation and especially in complex disasters, where malnutrition, overcrowding and lack of basic sanitation is present, there can be “catastrophic outbreaks of gastroenteritis (caused by cholera or other diseases).” (PAHO: 2000) Public-private partnerships could be used as a means for tackling the problem of access to essential drugs for poor and disaster-struck populations. The basic mechanisms of public-private partnerships could also be useful for other types of access, for example to water and sanitation (Widdus 2001).

The IASC (Inter-Agency Standing Committee) cluster approach has a global water, sanitation and hygiene cluster called the WASH-cluster. The cluster approach is aimed at addressing gaps in emergency response in order to improve quality in humanitarian assistance. This is done through strengthening the coordination and partnerships between UN agencies, international organizations and NGOs, as well as the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement. This cluster, launched in 2005, is led by UNICEF, which means that when the cluster approach is applied in an emergency, UNICEF leads national coordination efforts concerning water, sanitation and hygiene. The WASH-cluster works in five strategic areas: WASH Sector Co-ordination and Advocacy, Information Management and Standards Policy, WASH Sector Capacity for Humanitarian Response, WASH Sector Preparedness, and WASH Sector Best Practice and Learning. (UNICEF 2012)

4.3. The Case Company Peepoople

Sanitation solutions can be a good business opportunity if companies manage to provide the services needed, gain revenues worth reinvesting and develop economic activities whilst improving people’s living conditions, given that studies show that one euro invested in water and sanitation access in developing countries can be estimated to give a return of 5 to 12 Euros. (Gröber et al. 2011) This is an opportunity that the case company in this study, Peepoople, have grasped. Peepoople is based in Stockholm, Sweden, and was founded in 2006 to provide sanitary solutions. Their mission is outlined as followed:

The mission of Peepoople is to improve poor people’s health and quality of life by providing them with a hygienic, safe and dignified sanitation solution. Peepoople takes a totally new, sustainable and easily scalable approach to providing safe sanitation to the world’s poor (Peepoople 2012).
The idea of the Peepoo is that it is “a personal single-use self-sanitizing biodegradable toilet”. The Peepoo was developed by founder Prof. Anders Wilhelmson in 2005 (Peepoople 2012). The Peepoo product and solution has been piloted in different cultures and a larger-scale pilot project, including production, has been put in place in Kenya. Now Peepoople have made a 3.5 million euro investment to start a fully automated production line of the Peepoo with a capacity of 500,000 Peepoos per day. The first deliveries are scheduled to take place on November 1st 2012. (Hansson, K. Interviewed 15 February 2012) Currently 13 people work at the Peepoople office in Stockholm, Sweden and Peepoople also has a local unit working in a slum in Kibera, Kenya. The business model of Peepoople is divided into different business areas: Emergency and refugee/IDP (Internally Displaced People) and Slum & School (see appendix 4). Peepoople began its business in a slum in Kenya, where the customers are the people who live in the slum and buy the Peepoo single-use toilets for themselves. The launch in the slum in Kibera has been successful and the business model there seems to work very well (Wilhelmson, A. interview 15 February 2012). The other emerging business area is the Emergency & Refugee/IDP area, in which Peepoople has only done pilot projects. Peepoople is at the moment seeking partnerships with humanitarian organizations to enter this business area (Ruiz, K. interview 5 February 2012).

4.3.1. The Peepoo Single-use Toilet

The Peepoo bag is an innovation developed by Peepoople. The Peepoo bag is innovative in the sense that it requires no water to function. The material the Peepoo bag is made of is high performance biodegradable plastic that meets the EU standard EN13432 (Peepoople 2012). The Peepoo single-use toilet offers privacy and security for its users and is especially targeted towards women and children. The single-use toilet prevents disease transmission, minimizes environmental pollution and can increase food production through structured collection and reuse of the used Peepoo bags. (Wilhelmson, A., Interviewed 15 February 2012) A picture and a description of the Peepoo bag is presented in appendix 5.

4.3.2. The Peepoople Emergency Response Model

Peepoople has defined a separate mission and vision for the emergency business units. According to the emergency business area plan the mission for emergencies is “to save
lives by preventing diseases at the source through providing easy access to hygienic, dignified and cost-efficient sanitation for the most vulnerable people on earth”. Their vision is to:” provide dignified and hygienic sanitation for the majority of people in need in all major disasters”.

The Peepoo bags have been tested in pilot projects such as in Haiti after the earthquake in 2010 and in Pakistan after the floods in 2011. The pilot projects were successful. The Peepoople emergency response is based on saving lives after disasters through rapidly handling excreta and implementing hand washing practices. Peepoople also supports recovery from emergencies by supporting home toilets and food security. The goal of Peepoople’s humanitarian response model is to reach 10 000 households within three weeks’ of an emergency and provide them with either in-home or shelter sanitation for three months. The model consists of three elements: Processes, people, and products. (Peepoople Humanitarian Response Plan 2011)

- Processes: This element contains the process for distributing, promoting, collecting, and disposal of the Peepoo.

- People: This element consists of national and international staff. The international staff is 1 promoter coordinator, 1 logistics coordinator and 4 assistants. The national staff is 8-10 promoters, 1 driver, and 64-100 community mobilisers.

- Product: One response unit consists of 150 000 personal packs of Peepoos’ and supporting products and equipment. The supporting products are 10 000 small buckets, Peepoo ‘Kiti’s’ and Peepoo ‘Yizi’s’. The supporting equipment is training equipment, equipment for staff, transportation vehicles and means for communication.

The idea is that the distribution model should be adaptive. The first days the focus is on rapid distribution and mass communication on how to use the Peepoo. After this community promotion and distribution begins supported by education about why and how to use the Peepoo as well as in why hand washing is important. This is followed by household promotion and check-ups as well as identification of vulnerable individuals. (Peepoople Humanitarian Response, 2011)
In figure 9 the emergency relief process, as planned by Peepoople, is presented. This process starts when a disaster occurs and a first assessment of the situation is undertaken. The distribution part is divided between the community distribution model and the collection of used Peepoos. If collection for some reason isn’t possible the used Peepoos can be simply disposed by burying them in the ground, since they are 100 % biodegradable.

The on-site distribution and education is based on a cascading training system where promotion and distribution is built through one Peepoople promoter coordinator who trains a Peepoo Promoters who in turn trains and monitors 8 Peepoo Community Mobilizers. Preferably, these comprise a mixture of men and women. One promoter and 8 mobilizers constitute one team that has as its target to reach 7-8 households every day. After seven days 8 promotion teams should have reached approximately 1300 families. Post-distribution evaluation is also done to ensure that the households have attained proper understanding of the product usage. (Peepoople Humanitarian Response 2011) The organization of community distribution is presented in appendix 6. This community distribution model has proven very successful in the Peepoople trials conducted for example in Pakistan (Berndtsson, M interview 15 February 2012)

4.4. Peepoople’s Corporate-humanitarian Partnership Building

Peepoople are now in the stage of building corporate-humanitarian partnerships to organize the distribution and implementation of the product and model in an emergency setting. In the following section the empirical data will be analysed in thematic sections divided according to the theoretical framework presented earlier.

4.4.1. Step 1 and 2: Facilitators, Drivers and Decision on Engagement in a Partnership

Peepoople founder Wilhelmson, A. (interviewed 15 February 2012) states, Peepoople wants to make sure that everyone can gain access to sanitation, which is not the case today. According to him there are two main flaws in the sanitation solutions today: they take too long to build up and they are too resource intensive i.e. they require too much time and money to accomplish. An example that illustrates the current situation was presented by Peepoople CEO Ruiz, K. (interviewed 15 February 2012, author’s translation):
If we take Pakistan [the 2011 earthquakes] where I was 3 months after [the earthquake] and attended the WASH-cluster meetings where they met up and coordinated. After three months they had reached out to 20% of them [the initial target group]. They had stated that they will provide one million with water and sanitation out of the 5 million [affected]. This means that they had already reduced 4/5 and the case load was only 1 million and out of this 1 million only 200,000 people had been reached after 3 months, so 800,000 people were still without any solution.1

Peepople believes that their product and model, as presented in section 4.3, can be of great help in emergency situations and that their main competitors are normal latrines and other solutions that aren’t mobile and are rather unhygienic, so actually there is no competitors product wise for the company (Wilhelmsen, A. interviewed 15 February 2012). Both CEO Karin Ruiz and founder Anders Wilhelmson (both interviewed 15 February 2012) stated that the foremost competitive advantage of the Peepoo is that it is a scalable solution for rapid disease prevention in an emergency situation. Ruiz, K. concluded that the competitive advantage of the product can be seen in three parts:

- It can be rapidly distributed on a large scale to prevent diseases from spreading;
- The Peepoo is very easy to use and usable at home;
- The Peepoo itself is very hygienic, since it is self-sanitizing and its disposal is safe.

In the future the main income for Peepople will be in the emergency area and not the slums, even though the slums are another important part of the business (Ruiz, K. interview, 15 February 2012). As Ruiz, K. (interviewed 15 February 2012) put it Peepople and their partners “need to take championship on the sanitation issue”. What Peepople needs from their partners here is access to the emergency areas i.e. the business area to work in. What the humanitarian organizations also have is local presence and implementation capacity, so they could easily get community distribution of the Peepoos moving. To acknowledge all this is important, because as Grant (2010) concludes, a company should focus on the capabilities that are most important to the company i.e. most likely to create competitiveness. Therefore it is good that Peepople is aware of their competitive possibilities and how to further develop them.

---
1 "Om man tar Pakistan där jag var 3 månader efter, då hade dom ju dom där WASH-cluster mötena där dom träffas och koordinerar. Då hade dom efter 3 månader nått ut till 20% av dom...av 5 miljoner så hade dom sagt att 1 miljon behöver water and sanitation och då hade dom ju redan skalat bort 4/5 så det vara bara 1 miljon som var case load och av den 1 miljonen så hade som efter 3 månader bara nått ut till 200 000 människor, så 800 000 människor hade efter 3 månader fortfarande inte fått någon lösning." (Ruiz, K. Interviewed 15 February 2012, authors translation)
When it comes to disasters, the Peepoo solution is not only good for emergency response, but it can be a more permanent solution to larger sanitation problems. Even when the disaster response is over it might be that there are not sanitation systems available, and here the Peepoo solution could slowly be implemented as in the Peepoople slum model, where the customers pay for the product themselves. Wilhelmson, thought that also many humanitarian organizations have started to realize that slum areas are a part of their capacity building work for preventing future disasters and here the Peepoople could be one way of already having a sanitation system that is not affected by disaster, since it is completely mobile. (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February 2012) This might be an aspect of the Peepoo solution that plays an important role in the future. As Kovács and Spens (2007a) conclude, the response to a particular disaster might vary in different disasters, so a solution that is flexible is most likely more competitive than un-flexible solutions. The possibilities of the solution could also be of use in the reconstruction and mitigation phase of disaster response.

Concerning partnership building, it was also evident in both the interviews and the internal company material that Peepoople is searching for appropriate distribution channels through partnerships. All interviewees agreed that the thing they need is some kind of information exchange, since they have the product and the knowhow about the product-specific distribution, but they need help in order to successfully plan the response, distribute the goods from contingency stocks to the disaster site and implement the solution on the disaster site. In addition to this Peepoople has a very ambitious goal for their emergency response business unit. According to Ruiz, K. (interviewed 15 February 2012) Peepoople is aiming at being involved in 20 big scale projects, with 50 000 people reached in every project, by the end of 2013. In the future the vision for Peepoople is to reach the majority of people in all major disasters. When this is taken into consideration Hansson, K. pointed out that Peepoople really needs to let their humanitarian partners handle the on-site implementation in the long run, so that it won’t be too resource demanding staff wise for a small organization like Peepoople. But Peepoople is also seeking to be some kind of expert organization, since Wilhelmson, A. said that one of their goals is “to be best in the world at humanitarian logistics”2 (Wilhelmson, A. Interviewed 15 February 2012, author’s translation).

---

2 "Vårt mål är att bli bäst i världen på humanitär logistik" (Wilhelmson, A. Interviewed 15 February 2012)
4.4.1.1. Who to Partner With?

Peepoople have mapped out the agencies that are most active in wash-activities and get most WASH-funding. In addition to this Peepoople has been looking at how disasters occur on a country by country basis, and if there are some cyclical tendencies for disasters in some countries that would require a more long-time presence. The countries that receive most WASH-funding have also been paid attention. On the basis of this information Peepoople has made a priority list for organisations the company would want to build partnerships with. Peepoople also aims at looking deeper into private foundations funding emergency relief such as the IKEA foundation. (Peepoople Emergency and Refugee/IDP Business Plan 2012) Peepoople’s goal for the end of 2012 is to have a partnership with five launching partners (Ruiz, K. interviewed 15 February 2012).

Peepoople have already established some contact with many of the agencies they have on their priority list. What is important to notice in Peepoople’s partnership approach is that they are looking only for large scale projects (involving distribution to 50 000 people). This is because Peepoople are concerned that the humanitarian organizations won’t be concerned about the importance of the project, unless it is run on big scale. The viewpoint of Peepoople is that if the project is to succeed it needs attention and engagement from top management, and they might not be interested in the project unless it operates on a big scale. With the top-level management engagement Peepoople hopes to get sufficient attention and help when the actual on-site implementation and distribution begins. One bad experience of an organizations neglect happened in a pilot run in Haiti, where the Peepoos got stuck in customs and the partnering organization didn’t care to get the Peepoos through, until one year later, when they all had to be thrown away. (Wilhelmson, A. interview 15 February 2012)

So we call it a partnership in the sense what all partnerships are: that we will gain from it and our partner will gain from it... but if we don’t gain from it, if [for example] the Red Cross doesn’t want to save the lives of these [people], if they don’t want to understand, then they shouldn’t buy from us, and then there is no reason for us to sell our products to them so they can stay in their warehouse (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February 2012, author’s translation).

Peepoople wants their products to be top priority and the organizations to understand that the product and distribution model actually can prevent disease transmission and

---

3 “Så vi kallar det för ett partnership i den meningen som i alla partnerskap: vi kommer att vinna på det och dom kommer att vinna på det...men om vi inte vinner, om Röda Korset inte vill rädda livet på dom här, om dom inte tror på det här, då är det ingen ide att som köper av oss...det finns ingen ide för oss att sälja till en kund som vill ha det i sitt lager” (Wilhelmson, A. Interviewed 15 February 2012)
therefore products need to be distributed as soon as possible after a disaster strikes (Hansson, K. interviewed 15 February 2012). If Peepoople partners on a large scale, both parties are more likely to actually make it happen and become successful, because both have so much at stake. This aspect has much to do with the first framework step where the partnership parties should decide upon common goals and discuss the drivers of both sides. The fear of Peepoople illustrates what a lack of communication in an early stage could lead to, meaning that if Peepoople is not clear enough about its expectations towards the humanitarian organizations, problems might occur later. It also relates to the partnership framework step 2, in which the parties decide upon what kind of partnership they should engage in. Interestingly, these aspects are not discussed in the Peepoople internal strategic material: Peepoople Emergency and Refugee/IDP Business Plan 2012.

The success of the project is essential for Peepoople, since they need to be successful the first time in order for the humanitarian organizations to believe in the product and come back as customers again (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February 2012). Stephenson (2005) has pointed out that there are high stakes for all organizations participating in humanitarian aid, so to get a particular humanitarian organization to place strong emphasis on a single issue might be a challenge for a company like Peepoople. However, the knowledge Peepoople has collected about disasters and different countries might help them operate together with humanitarian organizations because, as Stephenson (2005) also pointed out the different capacities of the host nations adds to the complexity of the humanitarian relief context. In this case prior knowledge about a country where a disaster happens can be of great value.

4.4.1.2. Challenges in the Partnership Building Process

You could say that those who have the hardest time to understand [the product and the solution] are not the ones who use it, but those who are supposed to help us implement and distribute it (Hansson, K. interviewed 15 February 2012, author’s translation).4

This quotation illustrates the feeling about the humanitarian organizations held by the interviewees. Most of the interviewees seemed to indicate that the humanitarian organizations might not operate in the most efficient and effective ways in distribution. All believed that the humanitarian organizations are experts in their field, but they thought that an outside perspective might involve Peepoople bringing in something

4 "Alltså man kan ju säga att dom som har svårast att förstå det är inte dom som använder den utan det är snarare dom som skall hjälpa oss implementera och distribuera den" (Hansson K. Interviewed 15 February 2012 )
new and possibly helping the humanitarian organizations improve their processes. Ruiz, K. (interviewed 15 February 2012) said that she had the feeling that the biggest humanitarian organizations especially can sometimes have very tough requirements for corporate partners, such as wanting them to stockpile for free and be prepared to deliver at any time, in addition to expecting that they have a mind-set that is not so close to partnership-thinking as maybe it should be – supposing that a partnership should be mutually beneficial.

During the interviews it was evident that Peepoople recognizes the differences between Peepoople as a company and the humanitarian organizations as NGOs. For example, Ruiz, K. stated that she thinks Peepoople could help humanitarian organizations create a new vision for sanitation solutions, since the humanitarian organizations knows a lot, but have somehow “given up” on sanitation. Founder Wilhelmson, A. (interviewed 15 February 2012) was on the same track concluding:

...They [the humanitarian organizations and the WASH-cluster] see toilets as hardware and then we have to teach people to use the toilets...5.

This view on the organizational attitudes was also supported by K. Hansson who highlighted the contradiction that somehow the users apparently don’t have a hard time understanding the product, but instead it is the humanitarian organizations that have a hard time understanding the solution, since it is “too good to be true”6. Field officer Berndtsson, M. told me that her experience during the Peepoo try in Pakistan was that the NGO people in Pakistan had been very surprised that the community distribution model worked out and that the users were so positive. The NGO people in Pakistan had wondered how Peepoople had achieved the community distribution and had shown keen interested in the model.

They were extremely engaged and everyone I met was very positive and helped me a lot. People from UN Habitat top management, like Kamran who was country manager or something like that, was very positive and suggested many ideas about how we could use the Peepoos in emergency response [...] there was a lot of will and ideas. (Berndtsson, M. interviewed 15 February 2012, authors translation)7

This indicates that, even though there might be some resistance, the model works as long as Peepoople gets to implement it the way they want to, but the problem at the

5 “...dom [organisationerna och WASH-clustret] är inne i ett toalett är hårdvara och sen skall vi lära folk att gå på toaletten” (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February, 2012, authors translation)
6 “För bra för att vara sant...” (Hansson, K. interviewed 15 February 2012, authors translation)
7 ”Dom var oerhört engagerade och alla jag mötte var väldigt positiva och hjälpte till väldigt mycket. Det var ju några från UN habitat toppen, exempelvis Kamran som är director eller något var ju oerhört positiv och hade många idéer om hur man skulle kunna använda Peepoon i emergency Response [...] det fanns så mycket vilja och idéer (Berndtsson, M. Interviewed 15 February 2012)”
moment seems to be in convincing NGOs that the solution works. This scepticism towards the product and the solution as well as recognizing the bureaucratic nature of the humanitarian agencies decision making goes in line with what Van Wassenhove et al. (2008) have concluded as major challenges for corporate-humanitarian partnerships. Here the fundamental factors behind successful partnership building, presented by McLachlin and Larson (2011) should be considered. The feeling the interviewees at Peepoople had about the humanitarian organizations indicates a gap between different organizational cultures as well as a current lack of a feeling of mutuality.

4.4.1.3. Peepoople’s Facilitators and Drivers for a Partnership

From Peepoople’s perspective it can be concluded that the main facilitators for a partnership would be:

- The humanitarian partners trust and recognition of the Peepoo product and solution;
- The humanitarian organizations capability to engage in large scale projects;
- A common commitment to project success.

The drivers for engaging in a partnership could for Peepoople be described as the following:

- To gain access to disaster areas and be able to implement the Peepoo solution there;
- Monetary drivers: to gain a partnership i.e. a customer who is prepared to buy and implement the solution and, if the project is successful, who will return. The Peepoo solution could potentially also be continued in the area even after the emergency response is over;
- Capability related driver: to understand how the humanitarian organizations work and how they have organized their distribution; to learn from them and be able to develop better solutions in collaboration with them; to develop an expertise in the area and “become the best in the world at humanitarian logistics”.

These drivers go in line with the statement of Maon et al. (2009) who mentioned strategic concerns as a key reason for companies to engage with humanitarian actors. According to the drivers and facilitators Peepoople has for a corporate-humanitarian partnership, it can be seen that the partnership type Peepoople is looking for, according to the Whipple and Russell (2007) classification, is a process-oriented partnership that
is focused on long-term integrated supply chain processes across different functions. The partnerships will though have an event-oriented character, since the responses to emergencies will happen on a project basis, for every disaster. But the overall direction of Peepoople is to create long-term collaboration with humanitarian organizations. The collaboration benefits could mainly be described as customer-oriented benefits, and productivity benefits as presented by Cetindamar et al. 2005. Customer-oriented benefits, i.e. a user of the Peepoo solution who will get faster access and on a broader scale, and productivity-related benefits in the sense that cost reduction and operational efficiency could be created through partnership Step 3: Joint Components and Activities

4.4.2. Step 3: Components and Join Activities

The joint activities in a partnership could take many forms as the planning situation is now at Peepoople. Peepoople would prefer one single model for all partnerships, but this might not be possible. Different NGOs have different organizational structures and ways of distributing emergency aid; therefore there are some options for Peepoople. Either they can educate the NGO staff in the Peepoo solution, or then the Peepoople field staff can be educated with for example the Red Cross delegate training (Hansson, K. interviewed 15 February 2012). Whatever the route chosen, Peepoople is never in the field “as itself” but always works within the partnership and is present through, for example, the Red Cross or Oxfam or another agency and the Peepoople implementing staff work as a part of the “mother organization”. Peepoople will never be present without a humanitarian organization, and will in emergency relief always work through a partnership

We will never be there [on the disaster site] alone, but always embedded [in an organization] or then we go there as the Red Cross personnel and then we are the Red Cross. Another option is for us to be present as consultants, but as subordinate to the Red Cross. We will never have our own Peepoople presence (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February 2012, authors translation).8

Concerning the shared responsibilities one thing is clear and that is that the humanitarian organizations will be the ones doing the initial needs assessment when a disaster strikes, and Peepoople will on the other hand be committed to be prepared to deliver when needed. (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February 2012)

8 “Vi kommer aldrig att vara ensamma, utan alltid embedded elekv så går vi dit som röda corsets personal, då är vi röda korset. Eller så är vi där som konsulter, mendå är vi också underställda röda korset. Vi kommer aldrig att ha en egen peepoople närvaro” (Wilhelmson, A. Interviewed 15 February 2012)
What the humanitarian organizations buy in the partnership is essentially three things: they buy the Peepoo bags with supporting products, they buy the on-site community distribution model (appendix 6) and they buy the Peepoople expertise either in the form of Peepoople personnel who arrive on site or as education of their own personnel within the Peepoo solution. This was emphasized both by Hansson, K. (interviewed 15 February 2012) and the internal company material (Peepoople Humanitarian Emergency Response, 2011). The expertise in the community distribution model is carried by the Peepoople promoter coordinator who coordinates the process with the partner organization and is responsible for establishing and managing the network of Peepoo promoters and community mobilizers.

An important aspect of the partnership is that if Peepoople wants to realize its business goals as presented by CEO Ruiz, then the staff burden of carrying out everything themselves would be very heavy, so Peepoople would need to train the humanitarian organizations’ staff and teach them how to implement the solutions (Hansson, K.). This way Peepoople would be mostly present from the beginning in the first initial projects, so as to see that everything works and “control” the quality of the output, since it is in the interest of Peepoople that the first large scale project succeed. Ideally at least the Peepoople promoter coordinator would then be from Peepoople and not from any partnering organization (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February 2012). It was not seen as a problem that the Peepoople staff would do some other activities required by the humanitarian organizations after the community distribution system was rolled out (Hansson, K. interviewed 15 February 2012). These all aspects are of core value considering the collaboration elements, such as the relationship oriented integration put forward by Mangan et al. 2008, in the partnership.

Hansson, K. and Ruiz, K. (both interviewed 15 February 2012) made the point that in order for Peepoople to understand their customer better and be able to plan and develop their product and distribution to optimally fit a disaster scene, it is important that they are a part of the distribution process on-site at least in the beginning. If they don’t know how the organizations work and what their needs or potential problems are, they can’t solve them either. This concerns especially the physical distribution from the contingency stock to the disaster site. Peepoople still need to understand this distribution chain better in order to optimize the pallet size as well as understand its own and the customer’s costs. It was also pointed out that there would at some point be a need, from Peepoople’s side, to have a second assessment as for how long the need for the disaster relief aid will be, so that Peepoople could optimize delivery and potentially...
bring in more products, for example by sea fright. It is clear that Peepoople have a ambition and will to understand their customers i.e. the humanitarian organizations. Another point also is that they need to be able to know how to optimize their distribution also from an internal cost perspective.

Another joint activity proposed was that Peepoople will share the burden of funding for a project together with their partner. They will help the partner do the fundraising for the project. Especially in the beginning of a project, Peepoople will assist in finding the funding for creating preparedness together with the partner. After this the plan is that the project should continue of its own accord (Ruiz, K. Wilhelmson, A. both interviewed 15 February 2012).

In the joint activities and components that were discussed during the interviews and in the internal company data it was clear that many of these correlate with the collaborative relationship elements that were presented by McLachlin and Larsen (2011). Information and resource sharing will take place, as well as joint knowledge creation. It is evident that Peepoople is striving for collaboration, and not only coordination or cooperation, since Peepoople wants to have integrated processes with their partner. It is interesting though that the partnership is much more encompassing than the corporate-humanitarian partnerships presented by Maon et al. (2009). Since the partnership, from a corporate perspective, has more than CSR related goals, it will be much more encompassing in terms of joint activities than the areas presented by Maon et al. (2009). The plans Peepoople have clearly shows that the lack of collaboration between corporations and humanitarian actors might not be as commonplace in the future as it is depicted by the available literature. The joint components and activities for Peepoople and their humanitarian partner could be summarized in the following points:

- The division of responsibilities will depend on humanitarian organizations internal organizational structure;
- The humanitarian organizations should buy the whole solution and Peepoople provides the expertise;
- Peepoople needs and wants to understand their customers i.e. be involved;
- Peepoople is prepared to share the burden of initial funding;
- There were very positive experiences from the Pakistan pilot project;
- There is clear supply chain collaboration effort from both sides
The collaboration efforts, joint as well as separate activities, and responsibilities are listed in table 4. In the table the different responsibilities have also been connected to aspects considering humanitarian logistics, partnerships, and collaboration that have been presented in the literature.

**Table 4  The division of responsibilities in a partnership between Peepoople and a humanitarian actor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The responsibilities of Peepoople</th>
<th>The responsibilities of the humanitarian partner</th>
<th>Joint activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peepoople will be committed to be prepared to deliver when needed, (related to preparedness as presented by Maon et al. 2009)</td>
<td>humanitarian organizations will be doing the initial needs assessment when a disaster strikes (related to disaster response as pointed out by Maon et al. 2009) and additional assessment later on</td>
<td>Share the burden of funding (related to information and resource sharing as presented by McLachlin &amp; Larson 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide expertise</td>
<td>Humanitarians buy the Peepoo bags with supporting products and the on-site community distribution model</td>
<td>Train/educate each other (related to joint knowledge creation as presented by McLachlin &amp; Larson 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peepoople never acts alone, but always “embedded” (integration as pointed out by Mangan et al. 2008)</td>
<td>The humanitarian organization is the actual actor, with Peepoople embedded in it and take part by providing access, local presence and implementing capacity</td>
<td>Creating preparedness together, by planning and later distributing together (related to preparedness as presented out by Maon et al. 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peepoople is responsible for establishing and managing the network of Peepoo promoters and community mobilizers</td>
<td>Will take over distribution on a longer term (related to reconstruction and mitigation as presented by Maon et al. 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a part of the distribution process at least in the beginning</td>
<td>Cover the distribution process (buy it and learn from Peepoople and handle it I future projects)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4.3. Step 4: Outcomes**

From the interviews two kinds of outcomes could be distinguished: practical outcomes and capability related outcomes. The practical outcomes are related to the distribution in three steps. First the distribution from contingency stock to the disaster, secondly the community distribution, and thirdly the continued distribution after the immediate disaster relief end. The practical outcomes are mostly related to the emergency relief
phases of preparedness, emergency response, reconstruction, and mitigation as presented earlier by Maon et al. (2009)

In addition to this Peepoople have the ambitious vision of being present in all major disasters providing sanitation for the majority of people. To achieve this and realize the whole emergency business area, Peepoople wants and needs to create its capabilities through partnerships so as to become “the best in the world at humanitarian logistics”. Peepoople has a competitive advantage in its product but needs the partnership to realize it and needs the knowledge related supply chain benefits in order to further develop the business model. As Hansson, K. (interviewed 15 February 2012) said, if the initial partnership projects don’t work meaning the humanitarian organizations don’t come back, they are in real trouble, since they run out of a majority of their planned business opportunities. The outcomes that Peepoople are striving for could be concluded as:

- Practical outcomes related to the disaster phases and the distribution process;
- Capability outcomes related to for example Peepoople’s wish to become “the best in the world at humanitarian logistics”;
- To realize the overall vision of being present in all major disasters in the future.

4.4.4. Step 5: Evaluation

The good thing about evaluating the practical partnership outcomes is that it is very easy to measure the usage of the Peepoos, since collection of used Peepoos is built into the process. This means that usage of the product can be measured, which in turn means that you can measure how well the users have understood and adapted the product. As Wilhelmson, A. (interviewed 15 February 2012, author’s translation) concluded, “you use it if you understand it”9 and the pilots have shown that the users use the product and indeed like it. So the outcomes, usage and distribution wise are easy to measure and would be visible for both parties (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February 2012).

Still, Peepoople haven’t yet focused too much on how to evaluate and measure the actual partnership and collaboration, since they are in the initial stage of building

---

9 “Om du använder den [Peepoon] så förstår du hur den fungerar” (Wilhelmson, A. interviewed 15 February 2012)
partnerships. This might cause problems later on in the process. As Van Wassenhove et al. (2008) recommends, an exit-strategy should be in place already in the building phases of a partnership. So, what Peepoople now should consider is that the partnership itself needs evaluation on a supply chain level. For example Hieber (2002) proposed that the whole process should be evaluated, starting from common drivers, a review of the collaboration (i.e. common activities), the information flow and also the aggregated results have to be specified in order to be measured. To ease the development of the internal evaluation process for the partnership itself the Hieber (2002:107) steps could be adapted for Peepoople's needs in the following manner:

- **Phase of initialization and configuration for the supply chain**: How did the facilitators and drivers work out? Was the scope clear for both parties or has there been any misunderstanding leading to dissatisfaction?

- **Phase of supply chain analysis**: The features related to coordination, cooperation and collaboration have to be reviewed. The critical areas of the supply chain have to be identified and the enablers of the process have to be identified. Are there any special activities or bottle necks that need special attention?

- **Phase of supply chain improvements**: Has the information flow, communication and responsibility sharing been in place? What is the need for further education and development?

- **Phase of supply chain performance measurement**: Here the aggregated results have to be reviewed for example in relation to the initial internal drivers as well as mutual goals. Performance reviews take place in the individual organizations, for example on a quarterly basis. For example a supply chain scorecard can be used for this.

**4.4.5. Analysis of Peepoople’s Partnership Building with Humanitarian Actors from a RBV Perspective**

Based on the interview and internal company data presented, the following structure, presented in figure 10, of the Peepoople emergency response supply chain could be established. Here it is important to note that Peepoople will need a partner for all stages, except the inbound production process. The need for partnership activities is marked with blue color. In figure 10 the partnership elements are in focus and therefore the phases of the Peepoople internal response plan (presented in figure 9) are not included in the figure. In the figure it is also possible to see the steps from the theoretical framework, here adapted to the partnership process of Peepoople. Figure 10 also indicates that the original theoretical model presented in figure 7 is not in itself sufficient as a model for corporate-humanitarian building in an emergency relief
context, because the phases of disaster (as earlier presented according to Maon et al. 2009) have to be considered. From the figure it is also important to note that some of the steps seem to overlap. This can be seen with step 4 that actually happens intertwined with step 3.

![Diagram of partnership building process]

**Figure 10 Analysis of the stages of Peepooples’ partnership building process**

Partnership wise the assessment and planning for the actual disaster is a joint activity, so in figure 11, which is created with the partnership elements in focus, it relies on the distribution/step 3 part of the figure. Also the other response phases as presented in figure 9 (implementation, setup, distribution and monitoring) take place in the Emergency response and recovery phase process parts in figure 10.

As Tomasini and Van Wassenhove (2009) concluded, a supply chain is activated when a disaster strikes. In this case this is the supply chain of Peepoople and their partner, which is operated jointly, as seen in the blue parts of figure 10. But what has to be noted, and has so far only been partly mentioned by Peepoople, is that the response can vary in accordance with the type of disaster. The elements to consider are the preparation process, the human resources, the knowledge and process management, as well as the affected community (Kovács & Spens 2007a). As seen earlier, Peepoople has been considering and planning for some of these elements and the responsibility sharing in them, but it is still a part worth further planning together with the partner.
As earlier concluded, the RBV perspective offers an “inside-out perspective on organizations” (Rouse & Daellenbach 2002:966) and through the data collected in this study the internal perspectives of Peepoople emerged. To go back to the partnership concept from a competitiveness perspective is rather interesting, since Besanko et al. (2010:415) define competitive advantage as “the ability of a firm to outperform its industry”. In the case of Peepoople they themselves claim the Peepoo solution is their main competitive advantage against what they see as their main competitors, the “ordinary” toilets like latrines and holes in the ground. The interesting part, from an RBV and partnership perspective is that, to “outperform its industry” i.e. beat their competitors Peepoople needs to have access to the emergency or disaster area.

As Rungtusanatham et al. (2003) have discussed, supply chain linkages will allow a company to acquire VRIN resources. This was also supported by Barney (2012 Forthcoming) who stated that supply chain management indeed can be a source of internal capability to create competitive advantage. From a corporate perspective the access to a disaster site could in itself be seen as a VRIN resource (as defined by Barney 1991) that can be accessed only by the NGOs. The permit or access to enter is valuable, since without it there is no entry to a disaster area. It gives the NGOs an advantage. Not that corporations and NGOs would be competing in a market economy sense, but from the perspective of corporate entrance, there is interdependence between corporations and NGOs due to the fact that they need each other for different purposes. This can be seen in the partnership plans of Peepoople. The entry to a disaster area is hard to develop for a corporation (Hansson, K. interviewed 15 February 2012) and that is why they need to partner with an NGO that has it. From a strategic perspective, a corporation can’t access a disaster site easily without an NGO partner, so there is no actual substitute for Peepoople to gain access to their main market area i.e. the disaster site, without their main customers, but also partners – the leading NGOs.

According to Rungtusanatham et al. 2003 a company also needs to control a whole package of resources and capabilities, so in order to achieve and accomplish this competitiveness that the product in itself contains, Peepoople need the partnership. Therefore the partnership in itself would be a resource; an asset, for Peepoople. Assets include available factors controlled or owned by the company (Ollavarrieta & Ellinger 1997). The ability to achieve competitiveness through this partnership would be a capability, since a capability, according to Grant (2010), is what a company can do with its resources in order to create competitive advantage and strategic benefits. What even
more strengthens the notion of partnership management and completion as a capability is that in order to succeed with this, Peepoople, according to the statements by Ollavarrieta & Ellinger (1997) needs different skills, assets, accumulated knowledge and processes as to succeed in the partnership. This is also, according to the interviews, what they are seeking from the partnership. They want to learn from humanitarian organizations and create a partnership that makes the processes better and creates mutual benefit. Since they have a product that is innovative and competitive, they can offer this as a resource for humanitarian organizations.

In a humanitarian logistics setting the context of the partnership in itself also becomes important, since the disaster area as a physical space for business operation is in constant change. This means that in order for Peepoople to sustain its competitiveness, it needs to sustain the partnerships i.e. the capability of managing the partnerships with the humanitarian actors. This is the overall outcome that is created by the practical outcomes presented in figure 10 and it underlines the view of Grant (2010) that resources should be seen as a bundle, and not separately from each other. The whole “package” of Peepoople needs to work out: they need to have the innovative solution, a partnership and a capability to manage this partnership in order to be not just competitive but to succeed in the emergency business area at all. Peepoople’s internal knowledge-acquisition capabilities will be tested in a partnership with a humanitarian organization. According to the views presented by Rungtusanatham et al. (2003) whether Peepoople manages to make use of the supply chain linkages present in the partnership will determine in the longer term if Peepoople can sustain the kind of competitiveness that its product and solution now offers. This is also acknowledged by Peepoople; during the interviews it emerged that if Peepoople don’t succeed with partnerships, they might as well just give up on the emergency business area.
Even though Peepoople currently discuss partnerships from quite practical a perspective, there are underlying strategic implications that are compelling reasons for engagement with humanitarian organizations. In figure 11, the link between resources, capabilities, and competitive advantage as presented by Grant (2010:127) has been adapted to the setting of Peepoople’s partnership building with humanitarian actors in order to get a comprehensive picture of the internal RBV perspective in the partnership-building process. In figure 11 the most interesting thing might be that the resources have been divided in two: internal resources and resources that can be acquired through the partnership (marked with red in figure 11). So as Barney (2012 Forthcoming) stated, resources can be acquired “from the market” and in this setting Peepoople can acquire them through the partnership.

Overall the resources of Peepoople, in this corporate-humanitarian partnership setting, could be classified using Grant (2010) so that the Peepoo product in itself is a tangible resource, the innovativeness in the organization and the ability to create such a product is an intangible resource, and the knowledge and the Peepoople staff is a human resource. In this classification the access to the disaster area as a VRIN resource could also be seen as a tangible resource. Reviewing the most important capabilities as presented by DeSarbo et al. (2007) and discussed earlier, the capability to manage the
partnership would be a management related capability and thus one of the key capabilities DeSarbo et al. (2007) mention.

According to Grant (2010) a company should focus on their distinctive capabilities, meaning the capabilities that make the company more competitive. If capabilities are looked at from a functional perspective, as Grant (2010) suggests, the capabilities that can be built in a partnership should be judged in relation to the main functional area they occur in. In table 5 the capabilities that are presented in the literature are reviewed in the light of the capabilities that came forth as important in the case study. In table 5 the capabilities found in literature and the case are also reviewed in the light of the capability hierarchy Grant (2010) proposes. The capabilities appear in hierarchical order, from cross-functional to activity-related capabilities, in the table. Interesting to note is that, so far, there were no actual single-task capabilities that Peepoople would have needed from partnership, but actually more general capabilities, which again shows that the partnership building in itself is of very strategic importance.
Table 5  The Capabilities that Peepoople Try to Create or Strengthen through a Corporate-humanitarian Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability as presented in literature</th>
<th>Capability that Peepoople could/wants to gain or strengthen through partnership</th>
<th>Hierarchical classification according to Grant (2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management-related capabilities</strong> - the ones that allow the firm to manage, control, and take advantage of all the firms' capabilities (DeSarbo et al. 2007)</td>
<td>The capability to manage the partnerships with humanitarian organizations</td>
<td>A cross-functional capability, linking more special capabilities with more general capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing linking capabilities</strong> are the ones that allow the firm to know and detect changes in its market environment so that it can compete more effectively (DeSarbo et al. 2007)</td>
<td>Peepoople wishes to gain information and knowledge about the field of emergency relief through the partnerships as well as get to know its customers better in order to provide a more efficient solution and be able to provide a even more competitive solution.</td>
<td>Broad functional capability that related to functions on a general level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capabilities related to operations</strong> (Grant 2010) <strong>Knowledge-acquisition capabilities</strong> from Supply Chain Linkages (Rungtusanatham et al. 2003)</td>
<td>Peepoople wishes to “become best in the world ad humanitarian logistics” Through collaboration Peepoople can create supply chain linkages that enhances the operational performance</td>
<td>Broad functional capabilities that related to functions on a general level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capabilities related to sales and distribution</strong> (Grant 2010)</td>
<td>Peepoople wishes to create a distribution system togheter with the humanitarian partners and therefore needs to strengthen its distribution capability through the partnership through learning from their partners</td>
<td>Activity related capabilities, coming from operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noteworthy is also that in order for the capabilities that are created or strengthened in a partnership they have to, as Grant (2010) puts it, become organizational routines in order to provide actual competitive advantage. As the nature of the capabilities Peepoople are aiming at gaining seem to be cross-functional and broad functional capabilities, it is important to notice that all capabilities (also capabilities that might not directly concern the partnership) have to work together and all have to be in place to create this “cross-functional” connection between capabilities.
4.5. Revision of the Corporate-humanitarian Partnership Building Framework

As can be seen in figure 10, the initial partnership building model did not correspond fully to the theoretical model built earlier. In figure 10 the model was compiled according to the specific circumstances of the case company Peepoople, but here in figure 12 the figure 10 and the empirical analysis have been used to revise the original theoretical framework (figure 7) so that it would fit the specificities of the emergency relief context. In this revised version of the framework (figure 12) the steps have been reduced from 5 to 4 in order to make the framework clearer.

- **Step 1. Facilitators & Drivers:** The sum of facilitators and drivers create the decision to engage in a partnership;

- **Step 2. Joint Components & Activities:** Both parties are engaged in joint activities according to their partnership agreement and the activities that need to be completed in the different emergency relief phases;

- **Step 3. Outcomes:** This step refers to two different kinds of outcomes: *practical outcomes*, related to each emergency phase and what have to be done in it, and *strategic outcomes*, related to capability building. The capability building happens at the same time as the practical outcomes so that capabilities are slowly built or strengthened through the whole partnership process. Step 2 and 3 happen simultaneously;

- **Step 4. Evaluation:** The whole partnership process can be evaluated as well as the different outcomes.

![Figure 12 A revised framework for corporate-humanitarian partnership building](image-url)
The revised framework (figure 12) is based upon and combines elements of the emergency relief phases as presented by Maon et al. (2009), the partnership model presented by Lambert et al. (2004), and the literature on the RBV presented in section 2.2. These elements were also included in the original theoretical framework (figure 7), but have in this revised framework been adapted to the findings in the empirical study concerning Peepoople’s partnership building process. In this revised framework (figure 12), the emergency phases play a much more relevant role in the partnership building process than in the original model (figure 7); in this revised framework there is a possibility to take into consideration context specific elements that occur in the field of humanitarian operations. It is important to note that this framework is therefore especially built for a humanitarian setting. In revising the framework the underlying idea in the Hafeez et al (2002) model for evaluating capabilities, presented earlier in figure 4, has been used. This means that, even though the function of the framework is something else, the basic frame of the business process and activities above (in figure 12 represented by the emergency relief process) and corporate and business goals below (in figure 12 the strategic outcome and goal of the process), serves as a guideline for the direction of the model. It is of course important to note that only the idea in the model is the same, not the usage or function in other than that both figure 4 and 12 are tools for some kind of resource and capability strengthening and creation.

The reality of disaster relief operations is very complex, so a model like this might seem simplistic. Still the framework could be used also as a tool, not only by Peepoople, but also by other corporations or humanitarian organizations in their partnership building processes to create more efficient response to global disasters. The idea is that the organizations and corporations involved can apply their own drivers, facilitators, and goals and view them through the model. The outcome will be different, but the elements will most likely be the same in every partnership building process, since this has been shown in both literature and the empirical study.
5 CONCLUSIONS

As mentioned already in the introduction of this thesis, more efficient means for responding to global disasters are needed (Schultz & Blecken 2010) and in disaster areas access to clean water and proper sanitation is very challenging (Shoaf & Rottman 2000). In this thesis, the case of Peepoople, a company actively searching for partnerships with humanitarian actors in order to be able to introduce its single-use self-sanitizing Peepoo toilet solution to disaster areas, has been presented and analyzed. This case has provided new insights on corporate-humanitarian partnership building, since the company does not have CSR or monetary donations as a starting point for collaboration with humanitarian organizations. The aim of this thesis was to increase the understanding of how corporate capabilities can be strengthened and built through corporate-humanitarian partnerships. The aim has been reached through an analysis of the case company Peepoople based on the theoretical framework presented in the end of chapter 3 and later revised in section 4.5. Several aspects of capability building has been presented and discussed in the light of both theory and the case. In this kind of partnership, both sides are active parties who participate in the implementation of the solution. As discussed, Peepoople is looking for a long-term process-oriented partnership with customer- and process oriented collaboration benefits that in the long term can create supply chain linkages that can be transformed into capabilities.

In the case of Peepoople, the product in itself is innovative and the interviewees saw the product qualities and solution abilities as their main a competitive advantage, but without efficient means of distribution, this competitiveness couldn’t be achieved. This brings in the more holistic view of company strategy and competitiveness coming from resources and capabilities. Peepoople’s whole emergency business unit is dependent on successful partnerships with NGOs which makes the situation very interesting from a competitiveness perspective. The company has no actual competitors concerning the product and the sanitation solution, but can’t access its market without a partnership, and unless Peepoople convinces the NGO’s to try, they can’t succeed, however competitive the product is. Considering the emergency vision of Peepoople, that is to “provide dignified and hygienic sanitation for the majority of people in need in all major disasters”, the partnership with humanitarian organizations is a part of the company strategy. When here looking at both the joint activities and partnership details as well as the more overall strategic aspects a picture of the corporate-
humanitarian partnership comes forth that highlights the fact that the partnership could probably not create or even aim at creating any kind of capabilities, unless the goal would be long-term collaboration. This would then mean that from a RBV perspective, capabilities could not be created in singularity event-oriented partnerships. This is supported by the collaboration literature that emphasize the need of shared activates and integration on several layers.

5.1. Capability Building as a Reason for Engagement in a Corporate-humanitarian Partnership

When it comes to the first research question on how capability building comes forth as a reason for building corporate-humanitarian partnerships it can be concluded that capability building can be seen as an overall strategic goal that emerges from the practical outcomes that the company wants to achieve through a partnership. From the case it was evident, that the capabilities that Peepople either wanted to create or strengthen were management-related capabilities, market linking capabilities, capabilities related to operations and knowledge-acquisition, and capabilities related to distribution. In the hierarchical setting of Grant (2010) this would mean cross-functional capabilities, broad functional capabilities, and activity related capabilities. Considering the general nature of these capabilities in comparison to the reasons behind engaging even in ordinary supply chain partnerships presented in partnership literature, it is most likely that other companies or humanitarian organizations would also strive at similar capability building in their partnerships. Therefore it is apparent that RBV as a perspective did provide new insights in corporate-humanitarian partnership building also on a more general level. Capability building could, based on the study, be seen as a strategic reason for a company for building partnerships with humanitarian actors, even beyond this particular case.

5.2. Strengthening Competitiveness Through a Corporate-humanitarian Partnership

The second research question concerned how a company can strengthen its competitiveness through a corporate-humanitarian partnership. The study provided some very interesting results. What is interesting, is the notion of the partnership itself as a resource and the management of it as a capability as well as the access to a disaster area as a VRIN resource. The long-term perspective is here important to keep in mind, since the partnership needs to be managed over a period of time in order to achieve
competitiveness. This conclusion is built on the existing literature, but brings in the RBV into a slightly new scenario, building on the supply chain linkages as capabilities and resources presented by Rungtusanatham et al. (2003). The context specific details concerning business in an emergency area makes the situation interesting and gives a new understanding of how a company’s resources and capabilities could be developed and discussed in an emergency setting. What makes the case special is that to even realize the competitive advantage that the Peepoople holds, the company needs to have a successful partnership with a humanitarian organization. These partnership synergies as tools for even using existing competitive potential certainly show that a company can strengthen its competitiveness through a corporate-humanitarian partnership. Reviewing the partnership as well as RBV literature, it was on the basis of the case possible to distinguish an indication of a need for long-term engagement, if capabilities are to be created. Only event-oriented projects will probably not make capacity building possible. This finding also goes in line with collaboration literature, where thorough integration is needed for successful collaboration. As for the generalizability of these results, it can be concluded that the lack of collaboration between corporations and humanitarian actors might not be as commonplace in the future as it is depicted by the available literature, and therefore these conclusions would be applicable also to other cases.

5.3. The Framework for Corporate-humanitarian Partnership Building

The theoretical aim of the thesis was to construct a framework for building corporate-humanitarian partnerships. This framework was presented in the end of chapter 3 and later revised in section 4.5. The initial theoretical framework proved to have some limitations if to be applied in an emergency setting. Still the framework in itself could generally function as a tool for any supply chain partnership building process, especially if the partners which to focus on resource and capability building. The first framework was, however, not suitable for a humanitarian emergency relief setting and therefore the revised framework provides a tool for corporate-humanitarian partnership with focus on the disaster relief process. In the discussions with Peepoople it was evident, that the phases of disaster relief have an effect on the joint activities as well as structure of the whole partnership. The revised framework is through applicable also to any other corporate-humanitarian partnerships, since it is adaptable to different circumstances at the same time as it has a rigid theoretical base.
Many partnership benefits have been presented in earlier literature, but in this study the RBV perspective has been provided as a means for better understanding corporate-humanitarian partnerships from a corporate perspective. RBV is useful for studying the relationships between a company's performance and its internal capabilities (DeSarbo et al. 2007), but the contribution to RBV that this thesis can offer is the discussion about resources and capabilities from a partnership perspective. Therefore it can be concluded that even though the RBV is a company internal perspective it proved to be very useful from a broader partnership perspective. It provided insights in the building process from the company perspective that could be applicable in other cases as well. This study also supports the supply chain linkages importance presented by Rungtusanatham et al. (2003) bringing this notion into a new light through supply chain partnership connections.

At the same time as this study also contributes to the RBV literature by bringing in the notion of capability and resource building into a corporate-humanitarian partnership context, the framework building in this thesis also contributes to both humanitarian logistics and supply chain literature by combining the emergency relief phases with the partnership building process. Since the emergency relief context is of a global nature, the findings of this thesis can contribute to society on a larger scale if more efficient responses can be achieved through applying elements of the framework presented.

As concluded already in the introduction of this thesis, more and more disasters happen and there is a need for more efficient response to these disasters, both from humanitarian organizations and from companies. The results of this study is a small step towards a more efficient global response to disasters, since the revised framework for corporate-humanitarian partnership building can be used as a tool also for other than the case company Peepoople. The model, with its theoretical foundation, is adaptable to different needs and is therefore relevant in a larger societal and global context. Both companies in different areas of business as well as humanitarian organizations can find some relevance in the findings presented and when it comes to corporate-humanitarian partnerships, the essence is the relief they are bringing to people affected by disasters globally.

5.4. Managerial Implications

It can be concluded that Peepoople have a competitive product and efficient solution to sanitation problems in disaster areas as well as the ability to help humanitarians with
funding sources and bringing new perspectives to old problems. What humanitarian organizations have is access to disaster areas and emergency distribution channels, local presence, and experience in emergency relief. Combining these actors could be the starting point for a very good partnership. This partnership can’t though be successful if the mutual facilitators and drivers aren’t clear, if the evaluation is unclear, there is no exit strategy, and no mutual trust and recognition is built. From a managerial perspective, the most important thing is to see the whole partnership building process as a whole and consider all elements carefully in order to be able to manage the partnership successfully and achieve the overall strategic outcomes.

The corporate-humanitarian partnership model that was created in this thesis, was also adapted and discussed in connection to the needs of Peepoople, largely answering the third research question about how the model could be adjusted for Peepoople’s needs. From a company perspective, there are some managerial implications that have to be considered in the partnership-building process for Peepoople. To have a model or framework, such as the one presented in this thesis, should ease the structuring of the building process. Based on previous experiences presented in literature also some other aspects have to be considered along the way, if the overall strategy and vision are to be achieved and the company wants to be “the best in the world at humanitarian logistics”. Overall Peepoople would need to make the practical outcomes more precise in order to be able to evaluate them as a part of the overall goal of meeting the company vision and at the same time developing the capabilities to “become best in the world at humanitarian logistics”. Otherwise it might be that the competitive advantage doesn’t last for long i.e. is not sustained. For the partnerships to be successful Peepoople also need to recognize the challenges related to the humanitarian context. One single partnership model might be possible only if it is flexibly built. Also the evaluation of not only the joint outcomes, but also the partnership activities themselves would have to be planned and take place.

5.5. Limitations of and Critique Towards the Study

In this study it has been concluded that an underlying reason for companies to seek partnerships with humanitarian actors can be related to capability building and resources. Still, this study does not answer if this outcome will be achieved or not, although it is theoretically discussed that a successful partnership would give the case company Peepoople the business possibilities and market position that it is aiming for.
Therefore the answer to the second research question is not totally complete, and would need further investigation and evaluation of a partnership to see if competitiveness is actually achieved in an extended corporate-humanitarian partnership. The corporate perspective of the study also limits the generalizability of the results to other companies. So the main limitation is that capability needs have been established, but whether or not they can be fulfilled is not fully answered.

Another limitation to note, as earlier mentioned, is that the case company has a special situation concerning its market position and business area. Some of the findings provided in this thesis might therefore be limited to only a small number of cases, where the company involvement is of the same kind as Peepoople’s.

5.6. The Quality of the Thesis

As discussed in the previous section this study has some limitations. The issue of trustworthiness hinges on the study’s results. This trustworthiness will be discussed in terms of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. What can be generally said about the interviews is that the respondents were all very talkative and seemed eager to share their experience. As a whole, the company has been very engaged throughout the study, so the data was very rich in information. There is also very little doubt that the respondents would have held back any information, since they were interested in taking part in the study and were all eager to hear the results and learn from them. This gives the interview data credibility in the sense that the interviewees presented their views with their own words and the researcher did not have to “fish” for answers. In addition to this the interview data was triangulated with company internal data. Therefore the truth-value in the study meets credibility demands.

As already mentioned in the previous critique towards the study, there might be problems with the generalizability, not because the study is a case study, but because of the special position of the case company in terms of their business areas and market position. Still the rigid theoretical background to the analysis provides a structure that increases the transferability of the findings. The dependability of the study is assured through the analysis of the empirical material that was done using recognized analysis methods. The data collection and analysis processes are accounted for and the interview guideline is added as an appendix to the thesis. This way it is possible for an external reader to track the research process and confirm dependability. The findings in this thesis derive from the data collected and this can be controlled through the
dependability measures mentioned. This increases the confirmability of the study. Since all conclusions are rooted in a rigid theoretical base, there is little that indicates that the study would be influenced by the researcher’s bias or values. The risk concerning confirmability is that the company perspective influences the study too much. This decreases the confirmability of the study slightly.

5.7. Suggestions for Further Research

The area of humanitarian logistics is as yet quite new as a research area; therefore there is a need for new research engagements concerning humanitarian logistics. This thesis has explored corporate-humanitarian partnerships from a corporate perspective and with a focus on the building process of the partnership through the lens of RBV. The thesis has proposed a framework for corporate-humanitarian partnership building, but this framework would still need further elaboration and validation especially in the areas of joint activities and partnership evaluation. The humanitarian perspective on the partnerships could also be useful to study further to gain a holistic understanding of corporate-humanitarian partnership efforts. It would be interesting to include the RBV perspective in a study concerning humanitarian organizations’ partnership building and capacity building overall. The RBV perspective could be included in further studies that consider the specificities of the humanitarian context and focus on the kind of additional special capabilities and resources required of actors. Because this study indicates new possibilities for the usage of RBV, there seems to be several opportunities for further studying RBV from different perspectives.
SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING

*Partnerskap mellan företag och humanitära aktörer: En fallstudie om Peepooples partnerskapsbyggande med humanitära organisationer*

1 INTRODUKTION OCH PROBLEMFORMULERING


Det resursbaserade perspektivet är ett företagsinternt perspektiv, som hävdar att ett företags konkurrenskraft bestäms av hur väl företaget i fråga kan utnyttja och använda sina tillgångar eller resurser (resources) och förmågor (capabilities). Ett företags tillgångar eller resurser är det företaget använder för att genomföra och förstärka sin

1.1 Avhandlingens syfte och forskningsfrågor


För att uppnå avhandlingens syfte har forskningsfrågorna indelats i ett teoretiskt syfte och forskningsfrågor. Det teoretiska syftet med avhandlingen är att skapa ett teoretiskt ramverk för partnerskapsbyggnande mellan företag och humanitär aktörer från ett resursbaserat perspektiv. Forskningsfrågorna är följande:

- På vilket sätt framgår företagens vilja att skapa förmågor som orsak för partnerskap mellan företag och humanitär organisationer?
- Hur kan ett företag stärka sin konkurrenskraft genom ett partnerskap med en humanitärorganisation?
- Hur kan det teoretiska ramverket, som skapats utgående från teorin, adapteras och utvecklas så att det passar Peepopes behov gällande partnerskapsbyggnande med humanitär organisationer?
2 PARTNERSKAPSBYGGANDE INOM DEN HUMANITÄRA SEKTORN - ETT RESURSBASERAT PERSPEKTIV

2.1 Humanitär logistik

Denna avhandling diskuterar partnerskap mellan företag och humanitära organisationer inom ramen för humanitär logistik och katastrofhjälp. Att förstå sig på den humanitära kontexten är väldigt viktigt på grund av de speciella element denna kontext medför.


- Katastrofberedskap (Preparedness): förberedelser och planering, samt koordinering och samarbete med andra aktörer
- **Katastrofhjälp** (Emergency response): omedelbar hjälp till katastrofområdet
- **Återuppsyggnad** (Restoration & Reconstruction)
- **Förebyggande** (Mitigation): identifiering och evaluering av potentiella nya katastrofer samt utvecklingen av åtgärder för att förmildra effekterna av kommande katastrofer

Den humanitära kontexten, med dess många aktörer, är en väldigt komplex helhet och det utgör en av de största utmaningarna för aktörer inom humanitär katastrofhjälp. Den humanitära kontexten består främst av människorna i behov av hjälp (beneficiaries), medborgarorganisationer (NGOs), de inblandade staternas regeringar och ämbetsverk samt militären och donatorer. Den stora mängden aktörer leder till utmaningar i synnerhet när det kommer till samarbete och koordination så att exempelvis hjälpåtgärder inte skall dupliceras. (McLachlin & Larson 2011)

### 2.2 Det resursbaserade perspektivet (RBP)

Det resursbaserade perspektivet (RBP) är ett företagsinternt perspektiv som fokuserar på hur företag, genom att effektivt sköta sina resurser och förmågor, kan skapa hållbar och långsiktig konkurrenskraft. I denna avhandling används RBP för att nå en djupare förståelse för hur ett företag kan stärka och skapa förmågor genom ett partnerskap med en humanitär organisation.


2.3 Kollaboration i en försörjningskedja


- Dela information med varandra
- Hitta gemensamma målsättningar
- Synkronisera sina beslutsfattandeprocesser
- Dela resurser
- Kommunicera
- Bygga kunskap tillsammans
Integration är inte bara ett resultat, utan också ett krav för lyckad kollaboration. Integration utvecklas i takt med att två partner går från att koordinera till att kollaborera i sina processer. Integration måste ske både internt och externt. (Mangan et al. 2008)

2.4 Partnerskap


- **Transaktionsorienterade partnerskap** arbetar främst med att lösa specifika problem och komma på lösningar på direkta problem

- **Händelseorienterade partnerskap** fokuserar på kritiska händelser genom gemensam planering och gemensamma beslut. En kritisk händelse kan exempelvis vara att hitta en flaskhals i försörjningskedjan.

- **Processorienterade partnerskap** är mera långtidsinriktade och strävar efter att verkligen integrera processerna i försörjningskedjan

För att ett partnerskap skall fungera anser McLachlin och Larson (2011:35) att företagskulturerna måste passa ihop med varandra, ledarskapsfilosofierna och teknikerna måste passa ihop med varandra, båda parter bör känna stark gemenskap och parterna måste vara symmetriska
Figur 1 En partnerskapsmodell (Lambert et al. 2004:23)


2.5 Ett teoretiskt ramverk för partnerskapsbyggande mellan företag och humanitäre organisationer

beaktats liksom också de olika aspekterna av det resursbaserade perspektivet (RBP). Ramverket är indelat i fem olika steg.

Figur 2 Det teoretiska ramverket

**Steg 1 Partnerskapets drivande och underlåtande faktorer**

Partnerskapets drivande faktorer är orsakerna till att engagera sig i partnerskapet emedan de underlåtande faktorerna är de för handen varande omständigheterna som gör partnerskapet möjligt. Båda partners drivande faktorer måste beaktas eftersom de påverkar förväntningarna för utfallet.

**Steg 2 Beslut om partnerskap**

**Steg 3 Partnerskapets komponenter**

Detta steg beror i hög grad på vilken slags partnerskap som ingåtts. De gemensamma aktiviteterna kan vara direkt relaterade till exempelvis logistik, förmågor eller de olika faserna av katastrofhjälp.

**Steg 4 Utfall och resultat**

Utfallet av partnerskapet beror på de gemensamma aktiviteterna och kan jämföras med de förväntningar och mål som fanns i början av partnerskapet. I bästa fall har det i partnerskapet skapats resurser eller förmågor.

**Steg 5 Utvärdering av partnerskapet och partnerskapsprocessen**

Det är av yttersta vikt att både partnerskapet i sig själv så väl som partnerskapsprocessen utvärderas, så att målsättningarna och förväntningarna för fortgående kollaboration kan justeras. I detta skede är det bra om parterna kommit överens om en “exit-strategi” dvs. hur de skall avsluta partnerskapet om det inte varit lyckat (Lambert et al. 2004)
3 KVALITATIVA FORSKNINGSMETODER


Sekundärdatal är både kvantitativt och kvalitativt data som samlats in av en instans för ett specifikt behov. Sekundärdatal kan vara väldigt användbart som tilläggsmaterial i deskriptiva och undersökande studier (Saunders et al. 2009) och därför har Peepoolens interna material och dokument använts som tilläggsdata i denna avhandling. Användningen av två typer av data gör triangulering mellan datatyperna möjlig (Silverman 2006).

3.1 Analysmetoder

En fördel med kvalitativa forskningsmetoder är att analysen av materialet kan påbörjas redan i ett tidigt skede (Patton 2002). Silverman (2006) föreslår följande struktur för analys av data: dataminskning, datautveckling, att dra slutsatser på basen av data och att bekräfta data genom att dra slutsatser. Tematisk analys ger struktur åt analysen,

3.2 Studiens kvalitetskriterier

I kvalitativa studier är det av yttersta vikt att kritiskt mäta kvaliteten av studien och des resultat (Silverman 2006). Logistiska studier har traditionellt sett utvärderats på basen av positivistiska kriterier, men när det kommer till studier med exempelvis kvalitativa intervjuer är detta sällan lämpligt. Trovärdighet, som kan mätas genom kredibilitet (credibility) överförbarhet (transferability), pålitlighet (dependability) och ratificering (confirmability), är ett lämpligt mätverktyg för kvalitativa studier. Kredibilitet är ett mått för studiens sanningsvärde och kan jämföras med intern validitet. Överförbarhet handlar om möjligheten att generalisera studiens resultat medan pålitligheten handlar om möjligheten att följa processförloppet i studien och kan jämföras med reliabilitet. Ratificering handlar om studiens objektivitet och det faktum att resultaten motsvarar verkligheten och inte forskarens egna åsikter. (Halldórsson & Astrup, 2003.)

För att avhandlingen skall uppfylla trovärdighetskriteriet har forskningsprocessen förklarats genomgående och diskuterats för att påvisa det vetenskapliga underlag den empiriska studien har. All data har redovisats för och är tillgänglig för allmänheten. Intervjuguiden skickades ut till fallföretaget på förhand för att öka avhandlingens ratificering.
4.1 Fallföretaget Peepoope


4.2 Peepoosees partnerskapsbyggande med humanitära organisationer

Peepoope håller som bäst på att bygga partnerskap med flera humanitära organisationer för att organiserar sin distribution och implementera produkten samt lösningen i katastrofområden. Följande stycke behandlar det empiriska materialet och är indelat enligt de temata som framkommen i den teoretiska referensramen.

Enligt Peepoosees grundare Anders Wilhelmson (intervjuad 15 februari 2012) finns det stora problem med nuvarande sanitetslösningar. Därför är Peepoosees främsta konkurrensfördel den snabba distributionen och lätt användningen av Peepoo som gör att smittspridningen minskar avsevärt. Men Peepoope behöver och vill samarbeta
med humanitära organisationer för att distribuera sin produkt och nå ut till katastrofområden men också för att lära sig av de humanitära organisationerna och hjälpa människor i nöd (Wilhelmsson, A. intervjuad 15 februari 2012). Peepoople önskar att de humanitära organisationerna skulle ha sanitetslösningar som en prioritet och prioritera den omedelbara distributionen av Peepoo samtidigt som Peepoople inser problematiken med de ofta väldigt byråkratiska humanitära organisationerna (Ruiz, K. intervjuad, 15 februari 2012). Viktigt att understryka i partnerskapen är Peepooples mål att "bli bäst i världen på humanitär logistik " (Wilhelmsson, A. intervjuad 15 februari 2012).

**Vad gäller steg 1 och 2** kan det konstateras så som intervjuerna visade att de understödande faktorerna för ett partnerskap de humanitära organisationernas förtroende till Peepoople, de humanitära organisationernas förmåga att engagera sig i storskaliga projekt och ett gemensamt engagemang samt att båda förbundit sig till att projektet skall lyckas. De drivande faktorerna å sin sida visade sig vara att få tillgång till katastrofområdet, finansiella faktorer och faktorer relaterade till att stärka och bygga företagets förmågor.

**Vad gäller steg 3** kunde man sammanfattningsvis konstatera att det under intervjuerna klart framkom att de gemensamma aktiviteterna kommer att bero på den humanitära organisationens interna organisation. Partnerorganisationen skall i vilket fall som helst köpa hela Peepoo-lösningen inkluderande distributionsmodell och Peepooples expertis. Peepoople strävar efter att förstå sina kunder så väl som möjligt och planera allt samarbete med dem noga och är förberedd på att dela bördan av att skaffa finansiering för de första projekten.

**Vad gäller steg 4** så kunde man säga att Peepoople i sitt partnerskap strävar efter två olika typers utfall: praktiska utfall relaterade till katastroffasen och utfall relaterade till företagets förmågor. Under intervjuerna framkom tydligt att Peepoople önskar lära sig och utveckla sina egna interna förmågor i humanitär logistik genom partnerskapen. Ett övergripande mål för partnerskapen var också att kunna förverkliga den framtida visionen om att vara närvarande i alla stora katastrofer i framtiden och bli bäst i världen på humanitärlogistik. Förmågorna Peepoople främst önskar utveckla berör flera av företagets funktioner (cross-functional, broad functional).

**Vad gäller steg 5** så kan man konstatera att de praktiska aspekterna av partnerskapen kommer att vara lätt att utvärdera eftersom distributionsmodellen

Figur 3 En analys av Peepooples partnerskapsbyggande

I figur 3 har Peepooples partnerskapsbyggande analyserats i enlighet med intervjuerna. Pilarna överst i figuren visar katastrofhjälpsprocessen och blå färg indikerar i vilka skeden av processen Peepoople har gemensamma aktiviteter med sin partner. Figur 3 baserar sig på det ursprungliga teoretiska ramverket men i och med analysen och det material som framkom var det klart att partnerskapsramverket måste anpassas bättre till de olika faserna i katastrofhjälp. Det är också viktigt att se att en del av stegen överlappar varandra och att de praktiska utfallen av olika aktiviteter tillsammans bidrar till den större strategiska helheten.

RBP är ett företagsintern perspektiv (Rouse & Daellenbach 2002:966) vilket har varit till stor nytta för att förstå Peepooples interna perspektiv på partnerskapsprocessen. Från ett konkurrensfördelingsperspektibet är det intressant att se på partnerskapet medan Peepoople redan i sig har en unik innovativ produkt, men inte kan utnyttja den utan ett partnerskap, eftersom Peepoople inte kan få omedelbar tillgång till ett katastrofområde utan en humanitär organisation som partner. Ur ett resursbaserat perspektiv kan således accessen eller tillgången till katastrofområdet från Peepooples synvinkel ses som en VRIN-resurs, som företaget erhåller genom partnerskapet. Men för att på lång sikt kunna förvalta den konkurrensfördel den innovativa produkten och tillgången för med sig måste Peepoople utveckla sina förmågor inom inte bara humanitärlogistik,
utan också förmågan att förvalta ett partnerskap i sig. Så även om Peepople för tillfället talar om partnerskapen från ett väldigt praktiskt perspektiv, så finns det ett underliggande strategiskt mål i bakgrunden.

4.3 Ett reviderat ramverk för partnerskapsbyggande mellan humanitär organisationer och företag

I figur 3 framgick tydligt att det ursprungliga ramverket inte fungerade optimalt i en humanitär kontext. Därför har ramverket reviderats (figur 4) i enlighet med figur 3 och förenklats att ha endast fyra steg:

- **Steg 1 Understödande och drivande faktorer**: Summan av de drivande och understödande faktorerna skapar beslutet att engagera sig i ett partnerskap

- **Steg 2 Gemensamma komponenter och aktiviteter**: Båda parter engagerar sig i enlighet med sitt partnerskapsavtal och behoven i de olika katastrofaserna.

- **Steg 3 Utfall: Detta steg hänvisar till två olika typers utfall**: praktiska utfall som har att göra med katastrofaserna och strategiska utfall som handlar om att skapa och förstärka interna förmågor. Dessa utfall sker simultant.

- **Steg 4 Utvärdering**: Både partnerskapsprocessen i sig samt det praktiska utfallet och målen för partnerskapet bör utvärderas.

![Diagram](image-url)

Figur 4 Det reviderade ramverket för partnerskapsbyggande mellan företag och humanitära aktörer
5 SLUTSATSER

Syftet med denna avhandling var att skapa en djupare förståelse för partnerskapsbyggande mellan företag och humanitära aktörer genom ett resursbaserat perspektiv. Detta syfte har uppnåtts genom en empirisk fallstudie av företaget Peepoople i vilken ett teoretiskt konstruerat ramverk testades gentemot realiteterna med fallföretagets partnerskapsbyggande.


Avhandlingen baserar sig på en fallstudie vilket begränsar möjligheten till att dra alltför generella slutsatser. Den andra forskningsfrågan behandlar konkurrenskraft och eftersom avhandlingen fokuserat främst på partnerskapsbyggande kan den andra forskningsfrågan anses vara bara delvis besvarad eftersom avhandlingen endast
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# APPENDIX 1  TABLE OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date and place</th>
<th>Responsibilities/ Position</th>
<th>Duration of Interview</th>
<th>Other interview related information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anders Wilhelmson</td>
<td>15.2.2012 at Peepoople office in Stockholm</td>
<td>Founder and Director of Research and Development</td>
<td>1h 42 min 22s</td>
<td>Interviewed together with K. Hansson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristian Hansson</td>
<td>15.2.2012 at Peepoople office in Stockholm</td>
<td>Senior Advisor</td>
<td>1h 42 min 22s</td>
<td>Interviewed together with A. Wilhelmson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Ruiz</td>
<td>15.2.2012 at Peepoople office in Stockholm</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>1h 37s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Berndtsson</td>
<td>15.2.2012 at Peepoople office in Stockholm</td>
<td>System Designer and Field Officer</td>
<td>40min 21s</td>
<td>Have been working on-site in Pakistan and Kenya with the pilot projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2  TABLE OF UN-PUBLISHED COMPANY INTERNAL MATERIAL

Table of Company Internal Material (non-published) Used in Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Document</th>
<th>Main area of Content</th>
<th>Created in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peepoople Humanitarian Response</td>
<td>Model, processes and internal planning</td>
<td>Written in 2011, updated in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Area: Emergency and Refugee/IDP Business Plan</td>
<td>Strategic mappings and business and partnership possibilities of Peepoople</td>
<td>2011 by Karin Ruiz and the management team of Peepoople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Chart</td>
<td>Division of business areas and internal responsibilities</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3  INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

Introductory questions

- Respondents answers questions in accordance with knowledge/area of responsibility, so that all questions are answered

Questions:

- What is the vision and what are the goals of Peepoople in 5 years?
- How do Peepoople define competitive advantage? ➔ What is Peepoople’s competitive advantage at the moment?
- What are peepooples foremost resources and capabilities
- The supply chain and distribution system of Peepoople at this moment ➔ what are the main plans so far? What are the main challenges so far?
- Earlier experience: How did you build up the collaboration with the partners you worked with in your pilot projects? (Pakistan/Haiti)
- What were the main (distribution) challenges during the pilot projects?
- What are your main distribution challenges at the moment?
- How does your partnership action plan look like right now (if there is one)?
- Who are the main actors you at the moment plan to collaborate/have a partnership with?
- The Peepoople emergency response plan is very detailed for on-site response- have you planned the partnership process before the on-site action?

The central concepts are clarified for the interviewee:

**Resource:** Firm’s resources are strengths that are used in order to create and implement the firm’s strategy. (Barney 1991)

**Capability:** A capability is what a firm can achieve and do with its own resources, in order to create long-lasting competitive advantage and strategic benefits. (Grant 2010)
Information collection for partnership model

- Respondents answers questions in accordance with knowledge/area of responsibility, so that all questions are answered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Interest/theme</th>
<th>Main Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Facilitators & Drivers for a Partnership | - What are the main reasons for you to engage in a partnership (with and NGO)?  
- What do you see as your contribution to a partnership?  
- What do you see as Peepoople’s main capabilities i.e. what are you good at/area you are strategically strong in?  
- Would you see a partnership as strategically important for Peepoople? |
| 2. Joint Activities in a Partnership | - What would a partnership ideally contain from your perspective? Have you planned the partnership engagement process activities before an actual emergency?  
- Do you think there is a need for different kinds of partnerships?  
- Do you see any other possibilities, than that your own personnel would work on site?  
- In what areas/functions would you have joint activities with a partner?  
- What would be primary joint activities?  
- How would the responsibilities be divided?  
- Would you want to carry through distribution through a partner or have the partner handling it?  
- Do you have a time frame/priority order for the development of partnerships?  
- What do you see as potential problems/barriers of a partnership?  
- In what stages of a disaster do you see yourself active?  
- How would you ensure priority of your own product (through for example customs) in an emergency situation?  
- Do you see yourself more as a provider or as an expert organization present in the humanitarian relief field? |
| 3. The Outcomes of a Partnership | - What are your main goals for partnerships?  
- What do you think you can learn/gain from a partnership?  
- How would you set targets/goals for you partnership? In what terms would these targets be?  
- Would you see a partnership as a resource for Peepoople?  
- What would the main distribution/supply chain benefits from a partnership be for you? |
| 4. Evaluation of Partnership | - Have you set up/planned to set up any measurement criteria for your partnerships |
Interview guide in Swedish

Introduktionsfrågor

⇒ Frågorna frågas i enlighet med ansvarsområde/kunnande, så att alla frågor blir besvarade men alla frågor inte ställs alla

Frågor:

- Vilka är Peepooples visioner och mål för 5 år framöver?
- Avd tycker du att konkurrensfördel betyder för Peepooples del? Vilka är Peepooples konkurrsfördelar?
- Vilka är Peepooples främsta tillgångar/resurser och förmågor (Resource/Capacity)
- Hur ser Peepooples distributionssystem ut för tillfället? Vilka förändringar har ni planerat och vilka är de främsta utmaningarna för tillfället?
- Tidigare erfarenhet: Hur byggde ni upp samarbetet tillsammans med era partners i era pilotprojekt (haiti, Pakistan etc.) vem har ni samarbetat med?
- Vilka var de främsta (distributions) utmaningarna i era pilotproekt och vilka är de nu?
- Hur ser era partnerskapsplaner ut för tillfället och vem planerar ni samarbete med?
- Er emergency-response plan för katastrofer är väldigt detaljerad – har ni planerat partnerskapet/aktiviteter före själva (exempelvis delat kunskap med era potentiella partners/planer att göra detta)?

Tillgång/resurser: Ett företags styrkor och tillgångar, vilka används i företaget och stärker företagets strategi. ⇒ ett företags tillgångar, förmågor, företagsattribut, organisatoriska processer, informaiton och kunskap.

Förmåga: Vad ett företag kan göra med sina resurser/tillgångar för att nå hållbara/långvariga konkurrersfördelar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tema</th>
<th>Huvudsaklig fråga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Facilitators & Drivers** | - Vilka är de främsta orsakerna till att ni vill engagera er i ett partnerskap med en NGO  
- Vad anser du vara viktigaste kontribution till ett partnerskap?  
- Vilka tycker du är Peepooples främsta tillgångar/resurser och förmågor?  
- Inom vilket område är Peepoople strategiskt sett starkt?  
- Skulle du se ett partnerskap som strategiskt viktigt för peepoople? |
| **Decision on Partnership & Joint Activities** | - Ett hurdant partnerskap skulle vara idealt för er del?  
- Har ni planerat pre-katastrof partnerskapsaktiviteter (utöver emergency respons plan)?  
- Tror du ni behöver flera olika partnerskap?  
- Ser du en möjlighet i att anna än Peepoople personal arbetar på plats?  
- Inom vilka områden skulle ni samarbeta med en partner?  
- Vilka är de främsta områden inom vilka ni skulle samarbeta med en partner?  
- Har ni funderat på hur ni skulle överbygga eventuella samarbetshinder?  
- Hur skulle ansvarsfördelningen se ut i ett samarbete med en partner?  
- Skulle ni vela att distributionen sker främst genom en partner eller av er själva?  
- Har ni en prioritetslista/tidsram för partnerskap?  
- Vad tror du de främsta hindren kunde vara?  
- Inom vilka faser under en katastrof ser ni er själv som aktivast? (förberedelse/respons/återbyggnad/mildring?)  
- Hur skulle ni se till att Peepoo som produkt finns högt på prioritetslistan (hos NGO:s)  
- Ser ni er själva mer som en leverantör eller som en expertorganisation? |
| **Outcomes** | - Vilka är era främsta mål för ett partnerskap?  
- Vad tror du ni kan få ut av det? (konkret distribution, att lära sig etc.)  
- Skulle et (bra) partnerskap vara en resurs för Peepoople?  
- Skulle ni få kapasiteter av ett partnerskap?  
- Vilka skulle de främsta distributions/ försörjningskedjejeförmånerna vara fir er del? |
| **Evaluation** | - Har ni tänkt mäta/efterfölja era målsättningar?  
- Hur skulle ni mäta era målsättningar?  
- Hur skulle ni ställa dessa målsättningar? |
APPENDIX 4  PEEPOOPLE ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

The Organizational Chart of Peepoople

The chart is provided by CEO Karin Ruiz and updated in the beginning of 2012. The chart presented is a modified version of the company internal chart. Personnel information has been taken away from the original chart.
The Peepoo consists of two biodegradable plastic bags, one within the other, measuring 14 times 38 centimetres (outer) respectively 26 times 24 centimetres (inner gauze). The design of the bag is aimed to be ergonomic as well as cheap to produce, so that a low price can be offered to the users of it. The Peepoo bag can be used once, sitting, squatting or standing. The bag can be kept in one hand, the inner gauze preventing all contact with the excrement or it can be put in a small bucket. The Peepoo toilet is not fixed to one place, but can be carried with the user, since it weighs only 10 grams. There is no odour coming from a used Peepoo bag, at least 24 hours after use, so a used bag can be stored in the immediate environment. (Peepoople 2012)

The self-sanitation process is based on the urea contained within the Peepoo bag. Urea is a non-hazardous chemical and is one of the most common fertilizers in the world. The breakdown process of faeces and urine starts when the excrement comes into contact with the urea and is broken down into ammonia and carbonates. This is driven by enzymes that naturally occur in faeces. This process increases the pH value of the material and therefore sanitation takes place. Harmful epidemics are reduced in 3 days.
to 2 weeks and finally the bag degrades into soil in two to four weeks. When degraded, the ammonia acts as a harmless fertilizer that is taken up by plants. The treated feces have a high value as a fertilizer and therefore a considerable market value. This can be especially useful in developing countries, where fertilizers are expensive and scarce commodities. A study commissioned by the Swedish Natural Museum of Science and Technology recently selected the Peepoo as one of the 100 most important innovations of all time. (Peepoople 2012)
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