Humanitarian *Futures*

TRANSITION TO TRANSFORMATION: SAVE THE CHILDREN IN A *FUTURES* CONTEXT

A FRAMEWORK FOR DISCUSSION

The Humanitarian *Futures* Programmes, King's College, London, would like to express its gratitude to Save the Children for its commitment to and enthusiasm for this undertaking – an undertaking which Save the Children recognised from the outset is also intended to help guide the wider humanitarian sector through some of the institutional challenges of the future.

HUMANITARIAN FUTURES PROGRAMME

planning from the future

KING'S College LONDON

1. **Transition to Transformation** is a scoping exercise, agreed between Save the Children and the Humanitarian Futures Programme, King's College, London, to provide initial reflections about the extent to which Save the Children is effectively preparing for the challenges of the future;

2. The exercise is intended to serve as a discussion framework to ascertain the extent to which the recent restructuring of Save the Children has at the same time enhanced its capacities to deal with the changing global and operational contexts that the organisation might have to face over the next ten to fifteen years;

3. The scoping exercise has been based upon Terms of Reference that can be found in Annex I, and is the result of interviews and desk-top research. The former involved interviews with 18 senior managers from Save the Children International, Save the Children member organisations and Regional and Country Offices, and the questionnaire outline can be found at the end of the ToR. The desk-top research is reflected for the most part in the Selected Bibliography section;

4. Save the Children's transition from a loose-knit alliance of independent organisations with "the same brand" to a centrally guided organisation with a shared vision and agreed humanitarian response procedures has taken almost two decades to evolve. It is a transition the results of which have to be commended for the vision, fortitude and persistence that drove the process. However, as ***Section 1: The transition process,*** also concludes, the transition is not yet complete. While structures and procedures are in place, there are many uncertainties that still need to be addressed;

5. Amongst the many accomplishments of the transition, or the restructuring process, one can point to a set of coherent guidelines about the response and coordination procedures of the organisation to which Save the Children members have agreed, implementation arrangements that can provide surge capacity, preliminary information exchange nodes and networks and prospects for a Humanitarian Intelligence Unit that will amongst other things "think" strategically about the future;

6. These important transitional accomplishments have without a doubt significantly rationalised and strengthened Save the Children. And yet, a question that ***Section 1*** poses is what overall perspectives about the future, if any, guided the transition process? And whether or not there was such a *futures* perspective, to what extent did the transitional process, itself, result in an organisation more risk averse and less inclined to complicate intra-organisational relations by embarking upon dealing with the implications of longer-term strategic thinking?

7. ***Section 2: Save the Children in a futures context*** looks at *futures* from three perspectives: (i) characteristics of the anticipatory organisation; (ii) innovation and innovative practices as an indicator of a *futures*-oriented organisation; and (iii) strategic leadership and the enabling environment. When it came to anticipation, interviews on the whole offered a relatively restricted view of the future, with climate change, more conflict situations, urbanisation and demographic trends being the main features. That said, there was general agreement that much greater attention had to be given to anticipating the future where new thinking, new space and new actors would enable Save the Children to meet its aspirations;

8. Similar to responses to anticipation, respondents recognised the need for greater attention to innovation and innovative practices, but at the same time gave little indication of what either might mean when it came to changes in the strategic and operational developments of the organisation. There was on the other hand a clear appreciation of the importance of engaging with a much wider group of traditional and non-traditional humanitarian actors in order to identify, prioritise and implement innovation and innovative practices;

9. When it came to enhancing the anticipatory and innovation roles of Save the Children, interviewees clearly accepted the importance of both strategic leadership and an enabling environment that could promote such *futures* characteristics. And yet, respondents felt that the restructuring process was still too uncertain to determine what sort of leadership role would be accepted by the organisation as a whole. There, too, was a relatively consistent view that the risk aversion so inherent in the organisation made a visionary leadership role potentially problematic;

10. ***Section 3: A framework for discussion – conclusions and recommendations*** recognises that Save the Children had embarked upon an impressive undertaking to transform itself into a more efficient and effective organisation, and has achieved considerable success. Now, however, it finds itself on the cusp of various institutional challenges. The "balancing act" that might be needed to keep the present construct in place may lead to compromises that will mitigate not only against *futures* thinking but also against trying to deal with the institutional implications of such thinking. Standard concerns about threats to funding and the reputational risks of failure may in a more culturally heterogeneous organisation result in greater reluctance to experiment and to more focused attention on the here and now;
11. Alternatively, Save the Children might accept that, in a highly competitive humanitarian world, greater daring and involvement in spaces where few have entered to date will best serve its global mission for children. It might therefore decide that *futures* thinking, greater attention to innovation, more strategic ways to develop leadership, more consistent and systematic partnerships with traditional and "non-traditional" humanitarian actors could provide a raison d'etre for the organisation that could transcend at least some of the challenges of the immediate;

12. This scoping exercise has explored aspects of the process that led to Save the Children's restructuring as part of a broader initiative to see what steps the organisation has taken to date to prepare for the future. More importantly, however, the issue for this discussion is what Save the Children – given its vision, ambitions and institutional constraints – needs to do to meet longer-term, future challenges. And here, the discussion must continue. In the context of that continuing discussion, it is worth exploring the experiences of other organisations in and outside the humanitarian sector to see if and how they deal and have dealt with such challenges. With that in mind, this paper is intended to be discussed at HFP's annual Stakeholders Forum to determine

- how and in what ways do participating organisations anticipate potential longer-term threats and opportunities for dealing with the future;
- what sorts of institutional structures and networks are needed, therefore, to be more anticipatory;
- how and in what ways is the consequence of such anticipation and speculation brought into the strategies and programmes of the organisation;
- how and in what ways does the organisation concerned with future threats and opportunities identify, prioritise and implement innovation;
- with whom and how will the organisation collaborate to ensure that it has the requisite capacities to deal with the future;
- how can the anticipatory and adaptive momentum of an organisation be sustained over time.

The need for institutional change is recognised among an ever-growing number of governmental, non-governmental and inter-governmental organisations with humanitarian roles and responsibilities. This momentum is timely in light of new and expanding types of crisis drivers and their intensifying dimensions and dynamics. It, too, is timely because of the increasing number of opportunities that are emerging to mitigate them.

Since 2007 the Humanitarian Futures Programme, King's College, London (HFP) has worked with a range of organisations in the United Nations system, bilateral donors and non-governmental organisations to assess their capacity to deal with the challenges of the future. One of the first with which HFP engaged was Save US. In this instance, Save's "fit for the future" capacities were focused on how the organisation would deal with a pandemic, and what sorts of procedures it should begin to consider.[1]

The opportunity to work with Save the Children (SC) once again opens another opportunity for the wider humanitarian sector to learn from the efforts of a major aid organisation to meet present and future humanitarian challenges. This particular "case study" arose towards the end of 2011 when senior management in the newly formed Save the Children International (SCI) invited HFP to consider the extent to which the organisation's recent restructuring would enhance its *futures* capacities. With that in mind, it was agreed that a scoping exercise, or, "framework analysis", should be undertaken to begin a discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of the new structure for dealing with longer-term crisis threats and opportunities. The basis of this analysis would be a range of interviews and desk-top reviews. The former would involve in-depth interviews with fourteen senior officials in Save members and four in SCI, while the latter would focus on relevant documents pertaining to SC's restructuring as well as a broader-based survey of literature pertaining to theories of change and decision-making as they applied generally to the non-governmental sector.

The resulting framework for discussion, ***Transition to Transformation: Save the Children in a futures context*** is therefore designed to see how and in what ways SC's restructuring has served to prepare it for the humanitarian challenges of the future. As the term in the title suggests, the organisation has gone through a decade-long transition, resulting in fundamental changes in its approach to humanitarian action.

Section 1: The Transition Process, attempts to capture the consequences of those efforts which resulted in many radically restructured ways that the organisation funds, staffs and responds to humanitarian crises.

The transition process, often complex and tortuous, has for the most part been successful. There is now a structure in place that clearly defines roles and responsibilities when it comes to "humanitarian response." There are agreed lines of demarcation, for example, between the recently created SCI-implemented humanitarian response system and the enhanced roles and accountability of country and regional offices.

These successes do not mean that the system is without remaining challenges. ***Section 1*** concludes with some possible challenges still to be resolved. For the purposes of this discussion framework, however, a far more significant conclusion is that these intensive efforts appear to have taken place without any systematic attempt to anticipate the broader context in which the restructured SC would operate. There appears in other words to have been no strategic vision that related the restructuring process to global transformations, or prospects for new types of threats and needs or profoundly different operating environments.

To that extent, as ***Section 2: Save the Children in a futures context*** suggests, the lack of a strategic vision that encompasses a more *futures* oriented operating context has meant that SC has not tested the relevance of its restructuring beyond the present. SC's restructuring efforts and its concomitant objectives need to be tested in terms of its capacity to relate to plausible global transformations, and to that extent SC needs to test its restructuring in what this second section describes as a "*futures* context."

In presenting ***Section 3: Conclusions and Recommendations,*** it is clear that Save the Children has to be commended for what many would describe as an institutionally brave, robust and creative effort to enhance the efficiency and impact of the organisation as a whole. And, while one can suggest that there are still challenges to be met, SC can be proud of the transition it has made from a disparate, uncoordinated and frequently dysfunctional set of organisations "with a common brand name", to an entity that reflects coherence and broadly speaking, common purpose and methods.

Section 3 is therefore less concerned about the transitional objectives which in so many ways have been met over a decade and more, and is far more focused on how durable this restructuring will be when it comes to facing future challenges. Hence, the conclusions and recommendations that arise out of this exercise have to do with the need to test these efforts against plausible future challenges and opportunities. To what extent can Save the Children's transitional agenda become transformative?

Section 1: The transition process

…And then [in 1993] I got on a plane to Somalia and met with the Save the Children-US people, and visited their programmes in Lower Shabelle and Baidoa, and met with the [US] ambassador; and, then our director said, "By the way, there are three other save organisations here. I haven't met them but maybe you would like to while you're here." So we went around Mogadishu, and introduced ourselves to the directors and staffs of Save the Children UK, Save the Children Norway and Save the Children Sweden. None of them had met previously, and that immediately set off

[1] *Humanitarian Futures Programme,* ***Dealing with uncertainty, complexity and rapid change: The Avian Flu case study – An exercise for Save the Children – US.,*** *November 2005*

alarm bells. The right hand didn't know what the left hand was doing; UN people were dealing with Save the Children representatives that were following different strategies and having different priorities. I felt that at least they should talk to each other....[2]

Almost two decades later, Save the Children has gone through what often had been a tortuous but clearly successful process to re-engineer its approach to emergency response. And yet as one looks back, the process lacked any sense of global and related humanitarian contexts to guide the transition. The challenge in that sense was "to keep up with a changing world rather than anticipate it." This lack of a more anticipatory context explains in many ways the emphasis placed on dealing with issues of the here and now, and these issues reflect a predominant concern with four inter-related factors: (i) the coherence agenda; (ii) the growing ambiguity of humanitarianism; (iii) humanitarian boom and bust; and (iv) bureaucratic complexities. All these in retrospect may explain in various ways why Save the Children achieved a transition that is not yet transformative.

The coherence agenda. Three years after the onset of the Somali crisis, a ***Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda*** reiterated the more general finding that the aid community at large continued to respond to crises in ways that lacked coherence, and were too often duplicative and underpinned by competition. Despite the UN General Assembly's 1991 initiative to create coordination machinery, there were few incidents in which these mechanisms were particularly successful, and that systematic and coherent approaches to humanitarian action were demonstrated. Coherence and coordination had become a mantra for the aid sector; and though the results were far less than optimal, humanitarian organisations recognised that these were criteria by which they would be judged more and more.

For Save the Children the continued lack of coherence was "an embarrassment." The fact that its brand name meant so little when it came to an agreed set of objectives or actions was on the one hand seen as a challenge to very basis principles such as children's rights versus children's needs. It also posed another threat. The so-called decentralised structure that marked the organisation since its founding in 1919 seemed unfocused and chaotic when compared by the 1980s with less decentralised global agencies such as CARE, Oxfam, World Vision and Plan International. This was seen ultimately to have potential financial consequences as well.

Restructuring to meet such challenges was focused for all intents and purposes on issues that pertained to the organisation's "internal structure." The potential consequences of a changing global context had little significance, and as the 2002 Harvard University's Humanitarian Leadership Program made clear, SC was not the only global humanitarian organisation that was struggling with coherence and coordination. This struggle was further compounded by the fact that the very nature of humanitarianism, itself, engulfed an ever-widening agenda that intensified the prospects for different operational priorities.

Humanitarian ambiguity. Humanitarianism was becoming an umbrella under which an array of differing interpretations and agendas sheltered. Early recovery joined the relief to development continuum, and soon a feast of acronyms led to a bewildering compendium of contending priorities that further complicated the organisation's efforts to agree on common themes and approaches across what was still the "Save Alliance." As one senior SC official noted, "We had to deal with the practical reality that we had one name and twenty five different cultures." The priorities of many of these SC members were at cross-purposes or just fundamentally different. Some members, for example, held sacred the notion of legislated child rights while others were focused on fulfilling a needs-based agenda. And in the words of a senior official in the organisation, "Sometimes I get worried that in trying to reconcile all these differences, we're losing the overall plot."

The ambiguity – the broadening and ever more fluid boundaries of the term, "humanitarian" – directly and indirectly consumed a great deal of Save the Children's restructuring time. Somehow, for a cross-organisational set of humanitarian guidelines and procedures to emerge, there would have to be more than a modicum of agreement about what "humanitarian" meant, what were common elements around which one could build consensus. It seems likely in retrospect that the pressure to deal with such ambiguity intensified once the sources of funding became less predictable. Dealing with "donors different priorities and their cultural differences" appeared to be tolerable until funding uncertainties began to trickle to the fore.

Humanitarian boom and bust. "Rwanda (1994-1995) ushered in a ten year boom for humanitarians," explained a former SC member's head of emergencies. "All of the big humanitarian agencies achieved phenomenal growth." Between the crises in the Balkans and those in the Great Lakes, humanitarian action was defining the role of many international and non-governmental organisations, and donor funding seemed bent on maintaining that perspective. For organisations such as Oxfam and Save the Children, this should have meant a bonanza. It was clearly the case for the former, but some who had been witness to SC's situation at the time suggested that the latter had failed to understand the full implications of boom time for the emerging humanitarian enterprise.

Save the Children had benefitted greatly from the mid-1980s Geldoff phenomenon when resources began to flood into Ethiopia.[3] The organisation with its well-established programmes in the country fared well from the attention that Ethiopia received. In that instance Save did not have to adapt its system to benefit from the exponential growth in resources. However, humanitarian crises towards the beginning of the

[2] A note on interviews. The discussion paper draws heavily on the interviews undertaken for the project [See: Annex I]. The authors do not feel, however, that the names or designations of those quoted need to be referenced. The reader will know that these interviews reflect the opinions of the interview base of 19 senior officials, supplemented by two officials that were not initially part of the process.

1990s occurred more and more in countries where Save the Children was not well established or was faced with aggressive competitors, and that meant that its formula of working in countries where it had programmes and offices was not relevant to the changing humanitarian context.

When Save the Children did awake to the more flexible approaches that would be required to deal with emergencies, it began to recognise that a new and more robust focus on emergencies was needed – one which was, and was seen to be, coherent and synergistic. That recognition resulted in a series of not always successful measures, symbolised by the 1993 agreement to create an independent secretariat for the Save Alliance. The distrust that surrounded most of these initiatives, however, made the Alliance very tentative about proposed reforms. Certainly it would seem that for the next decade, the idea of a coordinated humanitarian strategy was in practice, anathema. Mistrust between a core group of members and throughout the Alliance permeated much of the harmonisation discussions that took place through 2008; and, only after almost two years of efforts, was there agreement on a transition process that would promote organisational harmony in dealing with humanitarian crises.

The agreements that emerged between 2009 through 2011 resulted in a substantial restructuring of the organisation.[4] Nevertheless, the tentative nature of many of the arrangements continues to be duly acknowledged, and the fact that many of the agreements were and are not legally binding, reflects the continuing experimental nature of Save the Children's organisational transition. In discussing the state of the present restructuring process, one highly experienced respondent used the present "Euro crisis" to describe the present situation. "We have gone recently through some very good times. Resources were flowing, and potential conflicts between members were papered over. This doesn't mean that when times get tough, there are not going to be those who might try to go their own way. There's nothing to stop them in the same way that the European states [in the EU] are sovereign entities. This fragility is recognised, and maybe skews our behaviour."

Bureaucratic complexities. "I am not just talking about normal administration. Humanitarian prominence has added tremendous burdens to our day-to-day work. It is not just the commitment to helping people that is the issue. The real problem for many of us is the time consumed by having to comply with accountability demands that are imposed by donors. Each one has its own procedures, demands and so on." This familiar refrain amongst many in the aid sector is seen as a persistent burden even in Save the Children's more streamlined structure. Even at the organisation's senior levels – where there is a general commitment in principle to longer-term anticipation, strategies and "blue sky thinking" – there is a clear nervousness among many of those interviewed that this will be yet another set of tasks, more meetings, more working groups and so on.

There was concern on the part of one Country Director that, if Save the Children started to move into more longer-term planning, "there is a danger of starting to reinvent procedures." At the same time a technical advisor within SCI reflected on the administrative challenges that now faced the organisation. For example, the person who is supposed to lead on monitoring and evaluation for around 80 programmes has to rely on the willingness of member organisations to follow the same schedule as well as to provide support to the centre to comply. At this stage, that person neither knows the key contacts in the 80 plus programmes nor her counterparts in member organisations.

On the other hand, several saw that the restructuring process has broken down various "silos," particularly between humanitarian action and development, and this is at least a trend that might mitigate against some sorts of bureaucratic constraints. It "has opened up new spaces and created new mechanisms for people across the organisation to both focus on strategic planning and to ensure that strategy and operations are clearly linked."

Section 2: Save the Children in a *futures* context

In the future, according to one of Save the Children's iconoclastic figures, the organisation will increasingly provide a "brokering role." "It will be an 'intermediary', a 'facebook' in a world in which donors more and more directly support individuals and programmes." Save the Children's role will inevitably be "lighter," and will result in fundamental changes for the organisation overall. It will be "connecting funds rather than taking funds from one sector and spending them on another". This sort of change will result in a significant reduction in full-time professional staff, far greater reliance upon volunteers and other networks that in turn may well require radical institutional changes in the organisation's structure, objectives and *modus operandi.*

The purpose of noting this observation is not to propose that Save the Children now alters what has been described as its transition agenda. Rather it is to ask how sensitive is the organisation as it is presently configured, to potential changes in an external environment that could require SC to transform its emerging global strategy, operating capacities and procedures and its very structure? How able in other words is SC to identify and understand the *what might be's,* and to find appropriate ways to adjust accordingly?

[3] "The Geldoff phenomenon" refers to the singer, Robert Geldoff, and his1984 Band Aid initiative to generate funds to deal with the Ethiopian famine.
[4] There were a series of agreements that occurred during this period. To name just a few, in September 2009, the Alliance Board agreed to one new governance model; in November of that year, a members meeting approved a 2010-2015 strategy including vision, mission and value statements as well as an overall Theory of Change. During that same meeting, the name, Save the Children Alliance, was changed to Save the Children International, and it was agreed that all programming under a Global Programme Delivery Unit. In July 2010, change managers started to work on an organisational transition, based upon working group outputs that amongst other matters dealt with the key IP functions. During 2011 the concept of regional offices were put in place, starting with a regional office for South and Central Asia.

The reasons for noting these questions rest on four assumptions. Organisations rise and fall relatively rapidly, and their inability to adapt to changes in their environment normally sounds their death knell.[5] Here, the assumption is that the intensified pace of change in science and technology as well as geopolitical and socio-economic contexts will pose a serious test for organisations' adaptive capacities.

A second assumption is that, in the humanitarian sector, the complexity of future crises will require far greater capacities than the loosely defined humanitarian sector has to date. This capacity challenge will entail more focused means to identify and adopt innovations and innovative practices as well as to develop partnerships and collaborating networks with "non-traditional" humanitarian actors. How to sustain such momentum offers another critical challenge, and in this case, the role of strategic leadership and the enabling environment that sustains such leadership inevitably become a critical factor in the anticipatory and adaptive abilities of organisations as they look to the future.

A third assumption is that organisations will need to see anticipatory and adaptive capacities as priorities, not add-ons. One SC official noted that, while the need for greater anticipatory and adaptive capacities might have substantive value overall, the fact of the matter is that to achieve such objectives, "the staff would have to work 75 hours a week." Here, the assumption is that organisations will have to choose which components of their agenda they will wish to keep and which to discard. Greater anticipatory and adaptive capacities should not be regarded as "add-ons".

Finally, the fourth assumption is to some extent an aspect of the first, namely, that organisations - be they fit for the future or not - have little choice about the extent to which they do or do not wish to adapt or adjust to changing environments. The pressure of events is inescapable, and the fundamental point is the extent to which the organisation wishes to be caught by them or to be adequately adaptive to anticipate them.

The anticipatory organisation

"One of our longer-term objectives is to be sure that education for children – building schools – becomes an automatic part of humanitarian response," stressed a senior SC official during an interview for the ***Transition to Transformation*** project. As a follow-up question, the interviewer asked about the priority one should give in a decade's time to school buildings in an intensely internet age, and whom the interviewee would contact to explore this question. In responding, the official seemed intrigued and a bit disconcerted. "Well, I don't think we ever thought of the implications of education in that sort of future. We would of course use 'word of mouth' and find experts, but I admit that there is a gap between what one assumes now and what alternatives there might be."

There is no doubt that sporadic efforts are made by various officials throughout those SC bodies interviewed for this project to think about the longer-term sources of future threats and opportunities. These, however, are generally clustered around a set of relatively standard categories,and perhaps more telling, there are few institutional opportunities to explore such possible *futures*. That said, the proposed "thought leadership" component found in the ***Save the Children Humanitarian Review and Strategy*** could open up the possibility of a more holistic approach to longer-term analysis. It is in that concept that recognition is given to the suggestion that "we should aim to create the 'Economist Intelligence Unit' for humanitarians," designed to establish the organisation's ability to provide humanitarian forecasting and high quality political and situational analysis.[6]

While the proposal, *per se,* does not offer a time scale that would define the outputs of thought leadership, its author in separate discussions recognised the need to see thought leadership along at least three dimensions, ie, long-term analysis in a twenty-five year context, operational planning within a ten year timeframe and short-term analyses covering "budget timeframes." The initiative, though in and of itself creative, does not answer some critical questions that a committed anticipatory institution needs to answer.

In the first place, an organisation committed to being anticipatory needs to promote what some have called "the anticipatory ethos" across the organisation. In other words the institution needs to ensure that staff feel comfortable in the knowledge that anticipation and speculation are valued. The purpose of a commitment to an anticipatory ethos is not to predict, but rather to ensure that staff are free to look for new ways of doing things, that strategies are tested against plausible alternative scenarios and outcomes and that risk is accepted and that failure is seen as a learning device.[7]

Generally speaking those interviewed for this project seemed to suggest that "Save the Children has a long way to go" when it came to that sort of preparation for the future. One interviewee noted that it was "early stages as far as preparing for new types of future threats." Though there was an effort to look forward, "it has not yet trickled down and … didn't know whether the process should trickle down from the top or trickle up from the bottom." In so saying, to date it would seem that the proposed "Humanitarian Intelligence Unit," for example, is intended to feed into the organisation from the top, with a few participating experts - depending upon what issues are regarded as important – chosen from SC members.

A consistent theme that relates to organisational ethos emerged during discussions when it came to "the need to ensure that everyone in the organisation at every level understands with great clarity that the organisation has a dual mandate which could help Save the Children be more focused and aligned." And yet, there was only one individual interviewed who discussed the potential interaction between development and humanitarian action – what the recently published UK

[5] *Tim Harford, Adapt:* ***Why success always starts with failure,*** *Little Brown Book Group, New York, 2011*
[6] *Mike Penrose,* ***Save the Children Humanitarian Review and Strategy,*** *7 October 2011, p.20*
[7] *Op cit. # 5*

Humanitarian Emergency Response Review referred to as the potential importance of the concept of resilience. Despite that interviewee's insistence "that there is a need to work across activities…which should be part of the DNA of every country office," the "dual mandate" appeared to re-enforce parallel rather than what should be interactive tracks. It is this theme of resilience that – if taken into a *futures* perspective – might well join the two.

In focusing on SC's possible organisational change in the future, one official stressed that "the SCI initiative will help make the organisation think in more detail about longer-term trends, and really take them more seriously….We have to look at this as a continuous kind of change process." There is in that sense a range of opportunities to strengthen the anticipatory capacity of Save the Children. The proposed Humanitarian and Leadership Academy is a case in point. Promoted as a new approach to capacity building in Save the Children, the academy is intended to foster amongst other things research into future trends and emerging needs. It is not insignificant that such *futures* perspectives are seen as a component for training amongst others, leaders in the humanitarian sector.

While the academy proposal and the humanitarian review and strategy both indicate a kind of institutional interest in speculating about the future, there are at this stage few indications about ways that the organisation as a whole would support this sort of orientation. In part, as suggested in the preceding section, "The reform agenda could not cope with additional efforts to reconcile contending visions about the world while we were immersed in the practical tensions of reorganising." In part, such a *futures* agenda would require fundamental institutional transformations that might "not sit easy at this stage with some potential members that we would like to consider joining us." And, said another interviewee, "There has been so much focus on setting up the new humanitarian structure and getting people in the right places and all the changes that happened in countries and at regional levels, that it has taken away a little bit of focus on preparing [for the what might be's]."

The issue at this stage is whether or not there is either a common understanding or institutional mechanisms to promote and sustain more anticipatory behaviour to enable the organisation to be more adaptive. The answers arising out of interviews are that

- the complexities of the present restructuring process appear to leave little room for more speculative reflection;
- there are relevant initiatives underway that could create space for longer-term thinking, but at this stage such initiatives are sporadic and not universally understood or agreed;
- there is a degree of uncertainty about what is meant by longer-term and *futures* perspectives and related time frames, but paradoxically there is general endorsement about the importance of such perspectives;
- there also is a degree of uncertainty about what the organisation will do with such longer-term perspectives, and this uncertainty relates, amongst other things, to how one will deal with the implications of such longer-term analyses in an organisation that will become increasingly culturally diverse.

Innovation as an indicator

"In the private sector," remarked the head of corporate social responsibility for a leading UK-based engineering company, "if you don't continue to innovate, you're out of business." In light of increasing competition in the humanitarian sector from both traditional and "non-traditional" humanitarian actors, the same aphorism might well apply to humanitarian organisations. Hence, the proposition that was explored in the research for this discussion framework was that a humanitarian organisation that is striving to be "fit for the future" will make considerable efforts to promote innovation and innovative practices.

The private sector, as evidenced by companies such as Google or 3Ms, actively foster innovation. According to one leading authority on innovation, they accept the consequences of what he refers to as a "knowledge spaghetti world" where "not all the smart guys work for us!",[8] and commends those organisations that promote cross-boundary communities of innovation and "intrepreneurship."[9] In an increasingly competitive and complex humanitarian environment, the implications of this approach to innovation has considerable consequence.

For the most part, those SC representatives that took part in interviews responded to questions about Save the Children's approach to innovation in terms of the organisation's own restructuring. Several respondents regarded SC's "change process in and of itself [to be] an innovation, underpinned by SC's 'theory of change'."[10] This included the creation of new "meeting spaces across the organisation such as global initiatives and steering groups." There were a similar number who felt that "the change process has not included mechanisms to facilitate more 'blue-sky thinking', which Save the Children has never done and which is a gap." There were only five who attempted to define innovation in terms of identifying, promoting and implementing new ways and practices for achieving SC's vision. And, those who did looked less into the future, and referenced such innovations as plumpy'nut and present analyses on conflict.

One issue that arose in four interviews was the difficulty of asking what was seen as "the old guard" to think differently and to be enthusiastic about innovation. A comment that generally reflected the attitude of the four was that "one of our mistakes has been that our recruitment has not been changing the old guard and that we have the same staff that we had before. We have great staff, great people who've worked for the organisation for a long time, but are not necessarily creative thinkers. For me at [my level], they haven't allowed me any freedom to bring in what I'd call innovative thinkers and

'outsiders'."

Three respondents, however, were not certain about the inherent value of innovation. One made quite clear that " I'm never quite sure how much we should continue to innovate or how much we should do what we already know. I've always been puzzled by organisations who have 90% of the answer to something and want to innovate and struggle over the other 10%." That said, the doubters as well as those who supported innovation as an SC high priority value opened up at least three doors of inquiry: (i) the meaning of innovation and innovative practices; (ii) approaches to identifying and implementing both; and, (iii) innovation and innovative practices from institutional perspectives.[11]

The meaning of innovation and innovative practices. There were no references during the interviews to types of innovations and innovative practices that might emerge out of future developments in science and technology. One respondent suggested that "we are in an existential change mode, and there has been no investment put into understanding what we mean by innovation….95% of our time is still spent on grant transfers." Another respondent felt that, that said, there were no clear views on what actually was meant by either innovation or innovative practices.

No reference was made, for example, to the sorts of innovations and innovative practices that can be found in vulnerable communities that might be worth scaling up. However, twelve of the eighteen interviewees spoke about the importance of "learning" from new members and the roles that SC country offices could play in that process.

Approaches to identifying innovation and innovative practices. There is a set of challenges that all interested in innovation and innovative practices face. These concern ways in which they can be identified, prioritised and ultimately implemented in order not to leave external programme and project partners in the cold. There was attention paid by some respondents "to the need to explore this more and be more proactive," and in so doing look to new actors such as the military and the private sector. It was also suggested by one of SC's regional directors that SC's role when it came to innovation could be to act as "a catalyst for innovation with partner organisations," engaging, for example, with the Government of Singapore to develop greater humanitarian capacities.

In that context, there was a sense that one of the purposes of partnership was to have others help in the process of identifying innovations and innovative practices. It was felt by at least three respondents that SC should engage more consistently and systematically with others such as ELRHA (the UK-based Enhancing Learning and Research for Humanitarian Assistance), academic and research institutions as well as the private sector. And when it comes to implementation, commented one representative from an SC member, the experience of multinational corporations such as Unilever has some relevance. "If they have an idea that works, it is taken up by its subsidiaries around the world." The compelling nature of the product is ultimately the determinant.

In that sense, a combination of a catalytic role, systematic and consistent engagement with partners and an effort to promote compelling "products" seem to circumscribe SC's main thinking around innovation and innovative practices. Each of these relate to the direction in which the organisation is developing.

Innovation and innovative practices from an institutional perspective. The potential for SC to act as an innovations catalyst would in no small part depend "upon the debate within Save the Children as to whether the programmes should primarily be implemented through partners or directly by Save the Children itself." That in turn, concluded the interviewee, would "depend upon the type of partnership," since SC's partnerships "ranged from governments and bilateral agencies through to small community-based organisations."

Similarly, so-called compelling products would also depend upon the ways that the organisation would deal with its dual mandate – now and in the future. The potential paradox is that what might be regarded as innovative for the humanitarian sector might not be regarded as such by development colleagues. Reconciling this possible conundrum may well depend upon the ways that the components of this seemingly bifurcated mandate can be integrated more effectively. To that extent, the comment from one SC country director seems to hold true when he noted that "collaboration certainly leads to more innovation. The more ideas we get on the table from people who think differently from us. I think that we've started to think about that, but we haven't mapped it really."
A representative of a major multinational corporation recently suggested that the reality of innovation and innovative practices is that they occurred "in a kind of white space," a space not necessarily determined by organisational structure or time determinants. The white space was nebulous and unpredictable and often resulted in outputs that had no relationship to the

[8] Taken from a talk given by Professor John Bessant, Associate Dean for Research and Knowledge Transfer, Professor of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, University of Exeter Business School
[9] "An Entrepreneur is someone who translates a creative thought into a new, innovative process, product, procedure, strategy or service. Entrepreneurs are risk takers who trust their potential. They turn their creativity into reality by pursuing their dreams and transforming a vision into a strategic plan. They strike out on their own and build small businesses.
An Intrepreneur is someone who displays the same characteristics as an Entrepreneur, but remains with an organization as an employee. They generate enterprise for the organization rather than create their own small business. In today's workplace, the benefits of entrepreneurship can be combined with the economies of scale enjoyed by large organizations by cultivating a culture of Intrapreneurship.", Elaine Beaubien, Intrepreneurs: Win them or Lose them, www.elainetrain.com
*[10] Save the Children's **Theory of Change** (Annex 2 in Save the Children's 2010-2015 Strategy) was introduced in November 2009, and consist of four main elements: (i) voice – advocate and campaign for better practices; (ii) innovate – develop and prove breakthrough solutions to problems facing children; (iii) results at scale – support implementation of best practices, leveraging knowledge to ensure sustainable impact; (iv) build partnerships – collaborate with children, civil society organisations, governments and private sector.*
[11] Humanitarian Futures Programme's Strategic Leadership in 21st Century Humanitarian Organisations: a scoping exercise. November 2009. www.humanitarianfutures.org"

activities for which those inhabiting that space initially intended. If such a white space concept might have substance, then clearly one of the challenges with which Save the Children will have to contend is who and how such a space or spaces should be filled.

Certain consistent themes arose out of discussions about innovation and innovative practices with SC representatives, and they are that

- while innovation and innovative practices are recognised as important, there is considerable uncertainty about what the terms mean when it comes to Save the Children's strategic objectives;
- the organisation has to determine the extent to which its role in the realm of innovation should be as a catalyst or as an implementer or both, and, if the latter, what proportion and pursued by whom;
- the relationship between partnerships and innovation and innovative practices was in principle understood by respondents, but greater attention had to be given to the range of partners – eg, private sector, Diaspora, universities, military, other NGOs – and the ways that they should be engaged;
- country offices might also be used to capture local innovations and innovative practices more consistently and systematically, but the interest to do this would have to be reflected in guidance from senior management at central and regional levels.

Strategic leadership and the enabling environment

"The challenge for Save the Children is to decide what are our default options. Is it to be risk averse or to serve as a moral compass? This has to begin with a grown-up version of talent development. Do we have a ten or fifteen year perspective, and are we going to invest in that journey now - safe in the knowledge that tomorrow, ten years from now, you have a leadership cadre that understands the world very differently." This reflection links into the interviewee's fervent belief that much greater emphasis in developing strategic leaders for Save the Children will require commitment to analyse what that future might be. The prospect for a "leadership academy" ***(See; page 8)*** was seen as one way to serve that purpose.

The sort of strategic leadership that would be willing to be more speculative, more daring and less risk averse was deemed to be necessary for the organisation. Such leadership would not have to be directly involved in management or operations, but rather would promote the organisation's vision and would challenge the organisation to do more in the ways of broader collaboration and innovation. "If the CEO," suggested one regional director, "talked to the regional directors, and said that we should be more anticipatory, then there would be a better chance of things happening and people coming up with solutions. Freedom to take risks breeds an opportunity to come up with solutions." And, noted another regional director, for those below senior leadership levels, one consequence of that sort of strategic leadership would be that "decision-taking would certainly be helped if the organisation were more anticipatory in its strategy. It would help particularly in taking early decisions about structuring for the future and not making decisions on the hoof."

That said, it was also recognised that the effective use of a strategic leader depends upon an organisation's enabling environment that sustains that leadership. The sorts of characteristics that foster an appropriate enabling environment include (i) organisational capacities and commitment to speculation, (ii) sustained efforts to have consistent and systematic means for collaborating with a diverse array of external actors committed to the overall vision of the organisation, (iii) organisational support for external partners when so required, (iv) multidimensional flows of knowledge and information that can be readily accessed, (v) range of realistic and contending decisional options for leadership, (vi) measures to be sure that policy options are not prematurely closed, (vii) mechanisms for challenging organisational "orthodoxies" and (viii) an organisational ethos that accepts risks and possible failure as important learning devices.

However, in exploring SC's capacities for fostering strategic leadership as well as an enabling environment, interviewees recognised constraints that could affect both. In the first place, there continued to be a lack of clarity about roles and responsibilities at various levels in the organisation; and, while there was general support for decentralised or distributed leadership, there, too, was a feeling that at this stage "where leaders are trying to be more innovative and anticipatory, decisions have to be approved by so many people and so many member organisations that there is a fear of decisions not getting approval." On the other hand, another respondent mentioned that "we are empowered to make the decisions, but we are never certain that the decisions we make fit with the thinking at the top because at the moment there is no clear guidance."

At the same time, several respondents felt that the role of leadership had also to be seen in terms of differences in the membership. One respondent, for example, felt that "smaller member associations would prefer to see strong leadership at the centre of the organisation, whereas some of the larger associations, including the UK and the US, would prefer to see 'networked leadership' that allowed them to maintain a strong voice in the overall direction of the organisation." In any event, while there were perceived differences in the attitudes between types and sizes of SC members, there was a far more consistent constraint that was suggested by interviewees, namely, a pervasive aversion to risk.

Leadership would have to overcome the reluctance of all too

many in the organisation to avoid risks. "Unlike pharmaceutical companies which have a research and development department to plan ahead," reflected one country director, Save the Children seems reluctant to invest in innovation and new ideas that might fail but also might make the organisation truly *futures*-oriented. "It assumes that innovation and new ideas grows organically…but if [SC's] leadership were really committed to making the organisation more innovative, it would have to provide us with the funds to do so." Or, in the words of another country director,

"We have a very sorry background on risk-taking. I'm much more likely to take on someone I know can deliver what we need to do now than take a risk with someone I'm not sure can deliver now, but I think might have bright ideas about the future. I have to be accountable to the bearers of the money now and that's one of the problems that we have."

One of the recurrent issues that emerged during the course of interviews was the relationship between the overall governance structure of Save the Children and the role of the strategic leader. If the SC structure was to become truly decentralised, then "the big decisions," it was assumed, would be taken at the country or regional levels. This would mean that strategic leadership would have to reconcile visions and strategic objectives with those of a diffuse structure. If on the other hand, it was more centralised, then it was assumed that the leadership at the centre would have an impact that was not as prone to the sorts of compromises that impact upon strategies and tactics in more decentralised systems. Though this last point might seem self-evident, it suggests that

- some fundamental aspects of the nature of leadership in the restructured Save the Children system still need to be addressed, and this links into assumptions about the nature of the Save the Children organisation and the way that it will function.; One challenge will be whether the proposed networked leadership can create an enabling environment for a strategic leader;
- at this stage, critical elements of an enabling environment for strategic leadership are not in place, and these in turn reflect the organisation's views about risk-taking and the priority given to innovation. It, also indicates that the organisation has yet to decide on the way that it will relate its vision and strategic analyses to its programmatic operations.

Section 3: A discussion framework – conclusions and recommendations

The conclusions and recommendations that emerge out of this initial scoping exercise should be seen as the first step in a much longer journey of exploration. Neither the methodology nor the scope of analysis to date can offer a definitive view of Save the Children's readiness to meet *futures* challenges. The scoping exercise, as the title suggests, should however open up discussions throughout the organisation about how its present structure, capacities and procedures relate to a world marked by transformational change. To what extent do the opinions and suggestions posited by some of the organisation's senior management reflect conceptual consensus – and with what negative or positive implications? If these views as presented suggest areas that do indeed require deeper analysis and more precise plans of action, how should that be moved forward?

Conclusions

1. Save the Children has undergone a timely, on occasion painful but to date successful transition, from a loose alliance to a coherent organisation, sharing not only a common brand but also now a common approach in preparing for and dealing with humanitarian crises. As organisational restructuring, it is commendable. While uncertainties and some doubts about procedures and outcomes abound, there is general agreement that the journey to date has been successful and the destination overall worthwhile and even essential.

2. Nevertheless, many see that the experiment remains unfinished, and that there are issues to be resolved, ranging from mechanisms to enforce agreed procedures to the practical realities of host member organisations. In that sense, one respondent's reference to the present "Euro crisis" has some relevance. There is considerable good will that has underpinned the restructuring process, but the fundamental institutional adjustments that will make Save the Children work over time have not as yet been made. Tensions about the respective roles of present members in times of humanitarian crises remain to be resolved. The certitude of common procedures and "natural compliance" are by no means automatic, and without appropriate structural measures in place and firmly understood and agreed, the restructuring process is on course, though fragile.

3. The durability of Save the Children's brave transition may not be tested in the immediate. It may, however, be tested as new member organisations with different geo-political and cultural differences, are brought into Save the Children's fold; or a clash of interests over "territorial interests" between two or more large members – fuelled by competition for funds – could also test the restructuring's sustainability. All of this is not in any way to suggest that the transition upon which Save the Children has embarked is not worthwhile or has not been successful so far. Rather it is to say that it is in that context of the organisation's transition to date that the prospect for an organisational transformation to meet the challenges of the future has to be seen.

4. For Save the Children, the transition process will either enable the organisation to take the next challenging steps to prepare for the future, or that very process will put a drag on any initiatives that might be seen to disrupt what some feel is a still delicate, if not fragile, consensus. Alternatively, Save the Children's willingness to undertake a transformation that will increase its preparations to meet the challenges of the future will reflect a balance between an agreed vision and careful steps

towards that end. In that sense, Save the Children might be at the final point of transition, but it has not as yet embarked on the road to transformation.

5. Transformation would depend in no small part upon the views of senior management about the environment in which Save the Children would be operating within the foreseeable future, eg, the next 10 to 15 years. To that extent, there appears to be little systematic or creative thinking about what that future might look like. Some saw this as the inevitable dilemma of an organisation that was trying to foster change with "the same staff we had before," but the challenge to the organisation most likely runs far deeper. The organisation as a whole does not attest sufficient importance to future perspectives. Primary attention to promoting efficiencies, to dealing with the ever present challenge posed by fundraising, to addressing the known crises now and to ensuring that the restructuring model works, dominate the institutional perspectives of Save the Children. Dealing with the "what might bes" – no matter how committed senior management purport to be – has not found a place on the organisation's agenda.

In lieu of recommendations

1. The implications of developing a more forward and strategic-thinking organisation depend upon a combination of leadership and consensus. The former is clearly evidenced by the strides made over the past few years to create a coherent Save the Children organisation, and in that context, the issue is whether leadership would now see the need to use those same capacities to move the organisation to a transformative stage to deal with *futures* challenges. The latter – consensus – will depend in the first place on the organisation as a whole understanding the substance of a more *futures*-orientation and the implications for the ways that the organisation will operate in the future and ultimately serve the children of the future.

2. This scoping exercise has explored aspects of the process that led to Save the Children's restructuring as part of a broader initiative to see what steps the organisation has taken to date to prepare for the future. More importantly, however, the issue for this discussion is what Save the Children – given its vision, ambitions and institutional constraints – needs to do to meet longer-term, future challenges. And here, the discussion must continue. In the context of that continuing discussion, it is worth exploring the experiences of other organisations in and outside the humanitarian sector to see if and how they deal and have dealt with such challenges. With that in mind, this paper is intended to be discussed at HFP's annual Stakeholders Forum to determine

- how and in what ways do participating organisations anticipate potential longer-term threats and opportunities for dealing with the future;
- what sorts of institutional structures and networks are needed, therefore, to be more anticipatory;
- how and in what ways is the consequence of such anticipation and speculation brought into the strategies and programmes of the organisation;
- how and in what ways does the organisation concerned with future threats and opportunities identify, prioritise and implement innovation;
- with whom and how will the organisation collaborate to ensure that it has the requisite capacities to deal with the future;
- how can the anticipatory and adaptive momentum of an organisation be sustained over time.

Selected bibliography

Casti, J. "Four Faces of Tomorrow," OECD International Project on Futures on Future Global Shocks, OECD, Paris, January 2011

Ferris, E., "Invisible Actors: The Role of National and Local NGOs in Humanitarian Response" in the Humanitarian Response Index 2009

L.R. Brown, ***Plan B 3.0: Mobilising to Save Civilisation,*** W.W. Norton & Co., New York, 2008

Conway, G., and Jeff Waage, ***Science and Innovation for Development,*** UK CDS, London, 2010

Damanpour, F.,"Organisational Innovation: A Meta-Analysis of Effects of Determinants and Moderators," The Academy of Management Journal, Vol 34, #3, September 1991, pp 555 - 590

Fyvie, Claire and Alastair Ager, "NGOs and Innovation: Organisational characteristics and constraints in development assistance work in the Gambia," World Development, Vol 27, #8, pp1383-1395, Elsevier Science Ltd, UK, 1999

Harford, T., ***Adapt: Why success always starts with failure,*** Little Brown Book Group, New York, 2011

Harvey, P. et al, ***The State of the Humanitarian System. Assessing performance and progress. A pilot study.*** ALNAP, London: ODI, 2009

Homer-Dixon, T., ***The Upside of Down: Catastrophe, Creativity and the Renewal of Civilisation,*** Alfred A. Knopf, London, 2007

Leonard, H. et al, "Integrative Risk Management, Risk Dialogue Magazine Compendium 2010

Mulgan, G, ***Public Strategy: Mobilising Power and Knowledge for the Common Good,*** Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009

Nelson, Debra and James Quick, ***Organisational Behaviour: Foundations, Realities and Challenges,*** 4th Edition, Thomson Publishers, Mason, Ohio, 2003

Jennifer, P., "Save the Children: Ambitious Reform and High Stakes Implementation Challenge," in the Hauser Center for Non-Profit Organisations, Adaptation and Change in Six Globalising NGOs: Drivers, Tensions and Lessons, Harvard University, March 2010, pp.5-10

Penrose, Mike, ***Save the Children Humanitarian Review and Strategy, 7*** October 2011

Ramo, J.C., ***The Age of the Unthinkable,*** Little, Brown and Company, New York, 2009

Save the Children, ***The Humanitarian and Leadership Academy: A New Approach to Capacity-building in Save the Children,*** 20 January 2012

Save the Children, ***Save the Children: Building a Global Alliance***

White, Stacey, ***Turning ideas into action: innovation within the humanitarian sector: A think piece for the HFP Stakeholders Forum,*** Humanitarian Futures Programme, November 2008, p.4 www.humanitarian*futures*.org

Wilson-Grau, Ricardo, *"The risk approach to strategic management in development NGOs,"* Development in Practice, Vol. 14, #3, November 2003, pp 1 - 4

Annex I: Terms of Reference

Save the Children: Innovation and organisational change
Discussion document & terms of reference

Background

The issues of capacity, innovation and new forms of collaboration are essential for dealing with growing humanitarian crises that the international community is certain to face. Within this context, the humanitarian sector, including international agencies such as Save the Children will have to become more adaptive and anticipatory, with significant implications for their organisational structures, governance and approaches.

Save the Children recognised the need for change almost 10 years ago with a commitment to urgently move toward a more integrated global strategy and organisation. Over this period, the organisation has implemented a challenging process of reform: expanding and strengthening the membership; integrating services and programmes through a 'Unified presence' initiative; and developing a coordinated global program, including the harmonization of core processes, facilitated and supported by Save the Children International.

As this reform process continues, Save the Children recognises the importance of capturing learning from the process and the transference of existing knowledge. This is seen as a vital step in strengthening the overall vision of Save the Children, to ensure that integrated strategies support this vision and provide a clear direction for Save the Children over the next 5 to 10 years. The strengthening of Save the Children's global vision also needs to inform the on-going development of an **innovative** organisation that can meet the humanitarian challenges of the future.

Organisational change, humanitarian action and innovation

This reform process clearly underpins SCI's Humanitarian Review and Strategy, developed in October 2011. The strategy also draws on the Save the Children 2006 experience in adapting approaches and behaviours to manage the uncertainty, rapid change and complexity associated with the threat from an Avian Flu pandemic. This exercise, facilitated by HFP, had a significant impact upon the way in which the organisation considered anticipation, innovation, adaptation, collaboration and leadership more broadly, as it was indicative of an emerging pattern of global, interactive and complex humanitarian crises. And demonstrated the value of being able to plan and be better prepared for other potential large-scale catastrophes in the future.

Considering the process of rapid organisational change, there needs to be a better understanding of the dynamic between this overall change process and SCI's new humanitarian strategy; how new organisational structures and behaviours might facilitate innovation and a shared vision of humanitarian approaches across the organisation; and the impact it may have on emphasising Save the Children's role as a 'dual mandate' organisation that can successfully integrate development and humanitarian programming.

Research parameters

The research will be carried out through desk-based research and key informant interviews with representatives from across Save the Children, including senior staff from a selection of Save the Children Members and Country Offices, as well as representatives from a small number of Save the Children partners and donors.

The research will be conducted by Humanitarian Futures Programme (HFP) in February 2012, with support from Save the Children International. Interviews will be undertaken in London and internationally by telephone. An initial scoping report will be compiled and produced by early March 2012 for discussion at HFP's Stakeholders meeting, scheduled for 19-20 March.

The initial **scoping report,** of approximately 20 pages, will summarise main findings from the key informant interviews, with the following proposed structure:

1. Executive summary
2. Review of SCI's change agenda
3. Perspectives on the way in which organisational change has facilitated emerging opportunities
4. Progress and challenges
5. 'Innovation gaps' and the road map for SCI in 2025

Research areas

Drawing on desk based research and key informant interviews, as above, the study will focus on 5 main research areas:

1. **Anticipation**
   – In light of what are increasingly acknowledged to be changing dimensions, dynamics and types of humanitarian crises, in what ways has the SCI initiative increased the interests and capacities of the organisation to be more speculative, to prepare for the "what might be's," and to begin to identify those types of issues and impacts that will intensify vulnerability in the longer term?
   – In what ways have longer-term strategic thinking and analysis been built into the new structure and what mechanisms and/or behaviours exist to ensure this occurs on an on-going basis?
2. **Adaptation**
   – With the new structure's strategic vision, to what extent does that vision reflect assumptions about the future and future challenges?
   – To what extent does/will SCI regularly review its strategy and update it in light of changing contextual and operational assumptions?

– What mechanisms might there be to ensure that SCI's strategy and operational programmes cohere?
– To what extent will the emphasis on a 'dual mandate' role facilitate or obstruct an emerging focus on resilience and the distinction between humanitarian and development programming?

3. **Collaboration**
   – There are a range of potentially emerging, "non-traditional" humanitarian actors, to what extent does SCI's reform process identify these (eg, the sciences, the private sector, the military, Diaspora) and in what ways might SCI engage with these actors?
4. **Innovation**
   – To what extent does SCI identify, prioritise and implement not only innovations but also innovative practices and behaviours?
   – How are innovations and innovative practices not only incorporated within the SCI framework, but also linked into the work of other operational partners?
   – What is the inter-relationship between collaboration and innovation and how can SCI intentionally use the former to address the latter?
5. **Strategic leadership**
   – What is the "enabling environment" for strategic leadership?
   – How does SCI provide that enabling environment which "permits" senior management to be strategic, anticipatory, innovative and collaborative?

Interview template

During the interview, we would like to discuss the following areas with you, which relate to the 5 research areas of the study (described in the project concept note). We anticipate that the interview will take around 40 - 50 minutes. In the first part of the interview we will seek to validate the information that we have obtained in our desk top research. In the second part we will be asking open ended questions.

1. INTRODUCTION (5 minutes)

INTRODUCTORY SCRIPT	
Purpose of research	Considering the process of rapid organisational change, there needs to be a better understanding of the dynamic between this overall change process and SCI's new humanitarian strategy; how new organisational structures and behaviours might facilitate innovation and a shared vision of humanitarian approaches across Save the Children; and the impact it may have on emphasising Save the Children's role as a 'dual mandate' organisation that can successfully integrate development and humanitarian programming.
Background on HFP	HFP is an independent policy research programme based at King's College London, and its aim is to develop strategies, approaches and tools to ensure that humanitarian organisations are prepared to meet the uncertainties and complexities of the future. It works with a wide range of partners – not only to help them but also to garner lessons, methods and 'tools' that will be of use to the wider humanitarian sector.

2. AFFILIATION WITH THE ORGANISATION (5 minutes)

ROLE	
What is your role in your organisation?	
How long have you been with the organisation?	

3. CHANGING HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT (5 minutes)

CHANGING HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT	
What do you see as the major trends and transformations that may affect humanitarian action over the next decade (possible future crises, changes in the operating environment, or opportunities for new types of response)?	
Against the background of these changes, how do you see the Save the Children added role and values changing in the future?	
What might the Save the Children look like in look like in 5 – 10 years?	

4. ORGANISATION CHANGE (10 minutes)

ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE	
In light of what are increasingly acknowledged to be changing dimensions, dynamics and types of humanitarian crises, in what ways has the SCI initiative increased the interests and capacities of the organisation to be more speculative, to prepare for the "what might be's," and to begin to identify those types of issues and impacts that will intensify vulnerability in the longer term?	
In what ways have longer-term strategic thinking and analysis been built into the new structure and what mechanisms and/or behaviours exist to ensure this occurs on an on-going basis?	
With the new structure's strategic vision, to what extent does that vision reflect assumptions about the future and future challenges?	
To what extent does/will SCI regularly review its strategy and update it in light of changing contextual and operational assumptions?	
What mechanisms might there be to ensure that SCI's strategy and operational programmes cohere?	
To what extent will the emphasis on a 'dual mandate' role facilitate or obstruct an emerging focus on resilience and the distinction between humanitarian and development programming?	

5. INNOVATION & LEADERSHIP (15 minutes)

INNOVATION	
To what extent does SCI identify, prioritise and implement not only innovations but also innovative practices and behaviours?	
How are innovations and innovative practices not only incorporated within the SCI framework, but also linked into the work of other operational partners?	
There are a range of potentially emerging, "non-traditional" humanitarian actors, to what extent does SCI's reform process identify these (eg, the sciences, the private sector, the military, Diaspora) and in what ways might SCI engage with these actors?	
What is the inter-relationship between collaboration and innovation and how can SCI intentionally use the former to address the latter?	

LEADERSHIP	
What is the "enabling environment" for strategic leadership?	
How does SCI provide that enabling environment which "permits" senior management to be strategic, anticipatory, innovative and collaborative?	