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President’s Message

Doug Brooks

A Decade in Stability

ISOA’s rise from Sierra Leone to Washington D.C. and around the world

Late 2000 saw contractors holding together the U.N. peacekeeping mission in Sierra Leone. Of course, 17,000 blue helmets from around the world were also contributing to the largest U.N. operation in the world at that point, but their forces had been routed in May 2000 by a handful of Revolutionary United Front (RUF) insurgents — essentially teenagers with no political aspirations who amounted to little more than a bloodthirsty street gang. The U.N. forces were ultimately rescued by a handful of highly professional British soldiers who then stayed on to keep the RUF rebels in check with judicious and appropriate use of force until the country and U.N. mission could stabilize. Even then, with a massive international presence in the tiny country, it was the private sector — hundreds of Sierra Leoneans working for contractors — that provided the actual logistics, construction and support services for the mission.

Back then, the contractors working in Sierra Leone were not considered part of an industry; they were simply companies contracted by various governments to perform specific tasks necessary to support international peacekeeping policies. A small group of academics and analysts followed from afar the role these companies played and debated the their strategic implications and problems. As a part of my academic fellowship at the South African Institute of International Affairs, I interviewed scores of Sierra Leoneans, as well as NGO officials, contractors, government officials and U.N. personnel. Contractors were running and maintaining the logistics trucks; flying helicopters supporting the U.S. Department of State, the Sierra Leone army and British forces; and rebuilding much of the infrastructure. Whatever one thought of private contractors back then, they clearly had a far more central role in carrying out the mission than anyone outside of Sierra Leone realized.

Even while there were plenty of problems to go around, concerns over contractor operations were utterly dwarfed by the numerous social and criminal issues created by the enormous imported U.N. force. While the United Nation’s presence did help to stabilize Sierra Leone in the long run, the peacekeeping mission brought with it many undesirable realities, including a thriving sex trade industry, which strained an already inadequate infrastructure. Fortunately, there was silver lining: many of the U.N. peacekeeping problems brought to light bolstered the landmark Brahimi Report, which advanced many vital peacekeeping reforms. Another positive outcome was the creation of what was to become ISOA in April 2001; an association based on a Code of Conduct originally written by NGOs and human rights lawyers to advocate for and improve the quality of the private sector support for peacekeeping missions.

In the ten years since its founding, ISOA has grown enormously in capability and influence, as has what is asked of the industry. Certainly, the fallout from the 9/11 attacks has dramatically expanded the demand for the stability operations industry, which has been deployed in large numbers to Afghanistan and Iraq. Large-scale natural disasters, such as the tsunami in Southeast Asia, Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans and the earthquakes in Pakistan and Haiti, have also required the critical services of contingency contractors. While the uninformed may speculate about the industry’s durability, the reality is that stability operations have always existed in one form or another and will continue to be essential so long as there are foreign policies, humanitarian
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SOUTH Sudan has successfully carried out its independence referendum and the government of Sudan has accepted the result — an overwhelming vote for secession. The people of the recently-named, independent country South Sudan should be congratulated on ending a decades-long violent conflict with a peaceful vote. The Sudanese government has acted constructively by allowing the referendum to go forward and by quickly endorsing the outcome.

The international community played a significant role in this process. The African Union, the United Nations and the United States each played central roles in negotiating, cajoling and pushing the necessary parties to ensure that the referendum would come off. All should be proud of the historic event that has transpired.

Now, the hard part begins. Four key issues will serve as obstacles in separating the South from Sudan. First, there will be the tortuous negotiations over oil reserves. Second, the disposition of the Abyei region remains an exceedingly difficult issue for the Government and the South. Whether there will be a referendum there and who will be allowed to participate, is the one matter over which renewed armed conflict could conceivably occur. Third, South Sudan will inherit a country with only 30 miles of paved roads, an uneducated population, significant ethnic divisions, an untrained government bureaucracy and little economic base beyond petroleum production. Fourth, Sudan, by losing a region that produced substantial amounts of national revenue, must face the unknown impact of the South’s departure, especially in relation the significant regional conflict and development challenges the country faces.

The Divorce

During the final months of the six-year interim set out in the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), the Sudanese and Southern governments will make arrangements for their divorce. The issues are numerous, yet all central to the fundamental concerns of each country. They include: oil revenue, borders, migration, citizenship, protection of minorities, security, currency and a fair distribution of Sudan’s national debt — and will only be determined hard negotiation.

No issue is more important than the future of oil revenues. Sudan depends on oil for 60 percent of its national income; for the South, oil accounts for more than 90 percent of revenue. South Sudan has 80 percent of Sudan’s oil reserves. One possible method of cooperation is structural, because while the oil is pumped out of the ground in the South, it is refined and shipped from Port Sudan in the North. The CPA provides for a 50-50 division of oil revenue, but expires in July 2011, and the division going forward will be the subject of hard bargaining. Alternatives that give the South more independence in the production process, such as building a refinery in the South or a proposed pipeline to Lamu, Kenya, would take years to put in place, while potentially causing significant conflict with Sudan.

Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that Sudan supplies up to seven percent of China’s petroleum needs and has been the recipient of substantial Chinese investment in oil infrastructure. The South Sudan government has reportedly pledged to honor previously agreed upon

Mark Quarterman is senior adviser and director of the Program on Crisis, Conflict, and Cooperation at CSIS.

Mark Quarterman | Leader

Implementing Independence

What comes after a successful referendum in South Sudan

Staring into the unknown. Photo: Tim Mckulka/UN
contractual obligations. While China has not played an open role in facilitating the diplomatic process, it is not hard to imagine that it is working quietly with North and South to protect its investments and ensure the continued flow of oil.

Other issues will be challenging as well. In addition to divvying up oil revenues, Sudan and the South must complete the process of separating themselves. Border demarcation has yet to occur and it will raise the question of nomadic herders’ migration rights. A referendum was supposed to in the region of Abyei, which is outside the South geographically, at the same time as the referendum in the South. However, the CPA did not set out who could participate in the vote, and the parties were unable to agree. At issue is whether the nomadic Messiria, who speak Arabic and identify with the North, will be allowed to vote as well as the Ngok Dinka farmers who identify with the South. This is a source of potential violence that must be resolved for Sudan to move beyond its legacy of violent conflict.

Along the same lines, whenever a region secedes, people do not line up cleanly on the “right” side of the border. Rather, there will be the issue of citizenship rights and the protection of minorities. Will people be allowed to hold dual-citizenship? Will some be stripped of citizenship and therefore lose property and rights, or be divided from family or business interests?

Finally, access to and production of water, especially the use of the Nile, will be a existential issue for the newly formed South Sudan, Sudan and Egypt. Ethiopia is an extremely important player in this game, because it produces close to 85 percent of the Nile’s waters. These countries need to cooperate to ensure the free flow of the Nile while also taking the water necessary for development. As South Sudan grows, its water use will increase, potentially putting pressure on its downstream neighbors.

These issues were meant to be resolved long before the referendum according to the CPA, but the regions’ respective leaders were unable to reach agreement. Fortunately, not all the obstacles require government-centric solutions. For example, some wise observers have suggested that rather than demarcating the border, the parties should create a border buffer-zone and allow nomadic pastoralists to move back and forth. This seems sensible, in part because South Sudan has a limited ability to effectively govern its full territory. It need not take on unnecessary governance responsibilities. At the same time, there is no such thing as a vacuum in governance. Local, traditional, customary methods of dealing with land use and movement can and should continue as the two countries, Sudan and South Sudan work out their separation. Governance does not necessarily equal government.

The key will be for the parties to establish effective processes to resolve these issues. The North and South have discussed their conflicts via the CPA without reaching any consensus. On many occasions, the parties have put off dealing with important and complex questions, but their time to procrastinate is rapidly decreasing. The North and South will need help — in logistics as well as mediation — as they did in the process leading up to the referendum. The African Union, United Nations and United States played complementary roles in the run up to the vote. They worked to ensure that the referendum would occur and now need to assist the parties’ in separation.

Other Challenges

Each of the countries that will arise from this process — South Sudan and a considerably smaller Sudan — will have considerable challenges before them. South Sudan is one of the poorest territories in the world. Providing its citizens with security and the minimum of life’s necessities will be a major accomplishment. Sudan still has conflicts in Darfur and other parts of the country. Whether the government, after losing the South, will have the strength and means to resolve these longstanding conflicts remains to be seen. Sudanese president Omar Hassan Ahmed al-Bashir and other senior officials still have indictments issued by the International Criminal Court to reckon with.

After decades of civil war, and six years under the CPA, the impending divorce of North and South Sudan will not be an easy separation. Each will depend upon the other for its economic survival. The cooperation between North and South during the interim CPA period was spotty. The stakes are increasing now, and the two new sovereign states need each other more than ever. Whether they can make this an amicable divorce remains in question.
The Future of the Stability Operations Industry

Defining stability operations in a changing world

STABILITY OPERATIONS is, despite media rambling, not a new term - and Stability is not simply replacing Contingency. Military branches and government agencies have used the term to define various types of operations. However, change in the industry over the last five years, including a heavy emphasis on civilian participation in high-risk environments, has placed stability operations squarely in civil society’s radar.

ISOA, celebrating its 10th anniversary as the association for private sector organizations working in conflict and post-conflict environments, recognizes that stability operations are not confined to one area or type of operation. In fact, those involved in stabilization efforts may be in theater before conflict actually occurs, working alongside military and governmental partners during crisis and conflict, assisting with reconstruction and setting the stage for long-term development. The private sector continues to be the nexus to success in operations in the aforementioned arenas, as stability operations continue to evolve.

This evolution does not come without its challenges. Dr. Arthur Keys begins by tracing the undeniable connection between instability and poverty, emphasizing the role that the private sector can play in sustainable development. This critical role is challenged by internal and external factors. How the industry reacts and adapts to changing federal budgets, communications opportunities and accountability questions will determine the evolution of private sector work in high-risk environments.

That industry evolution will occur in a vibrant market for contractors. Shawn James and Nicholas Bell explore the undercurrents of the competitive environment in which stability contractors operate, noting that emphasis on price over quality exists alongside vast opportunities for multidimensional approaches and innovation. A move toward the latter will only benefit the achievement of U.S. foreign policy objectives as the industry solidifies its role.

In the past, the three D’s—defense, diplomacy and development—defined U.S. foreign policy strategy. For the future, Ignacio Balderas discusses the application of President Obama’s domestic plan for public/private partnerships, or the three P’s, to stability operations worldwide. A “3D + 3P” approach would provide greater integration and coordination between the U.S.’s big three foreign aid implementing agencies – DoD, State and USAID – and private sector actors. With proper oversight and transparency paired with support from ISOA, this new model could be the next big evolutionary step for this global industry.

Figuring out what’s next may mean getting back to basics. Chris Taylor traces the timeline of the industry from 9/11 to even more recent history, pointing to the challenges facing the industry and best practices for the next era of stability operations. While contracts and investment solidify the existence of the industry moving forward, its reputation depends on the businesses working within it. Accountability, transparency, certification, communication and quality will determine the stability operations industry’s future role as a responsible and ethical player in the achievement of foreign policy goals, development and human freedom.

Next issue, the Feature section will be Humanitarian Security.

Left: Doug Brooks speaks to a member at a recent conference. Photo: ISOA; Right: A look at the stability operations industry. Collage graphic: Atlantic Exhibits
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Forging Peace in the Midst of Conflict

Meeting the challenges of stabilization to secure the future

THE United States government and private sector organizations have long been involved in efforts to establish conditions conducive to long-term peace and development, but only recently has this work been labeled “stability operations.” It is even more recently that private sector groups involved in stability operations have organized themselves into an “industry.”

Stability and Development

Development professionals have known for decades of the strong relationship between instability and poverty, lack of freedoms and other forms of suffering. What is new is that the development and stability communities are now reaching a consensus on how best to link stability operations to longer-term development solutions for nations emerging from conflict.

Stabilization activities are not a substitute for development programs, but they certainly can help lay the foundation upon which long-term development efforts can be built to achieve a more rapid — and sustainable — impact. The standardization of stability operations as a distinct foreign affairs discipline is largely a result of their emerging importance in U.S. foreign policy efforts over the last two decades. From the Western Balkans to Haiti to Somalia, it is widely acknowledged that the primary threats to U.S. national security emanate from unstable or failed states that allow terrorist entities to take root and spread their authority and influence.

Stability is essential to the sustainable development that can permanently lift communities and nations out of poverty and put them on the road to economic growth, a strong civil society and increased government responsiveness and accountability. President Barack Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton have supported capacity building efforts in fragile states like Sudan, Afghanistan and Pakistan. They understand that stability opens avenues to opportunity for individuals, communities and businesses to unleash innovation; encourages domestic and foreign direct investment; and promotes free enterprise and job creation alternatives for large numbers of unemployed or disaffected workers who may otherwise be open to recruitment from terrorist organizations. In short, communities that receive the support to develop their own markets, capacities and governance systems will become more stable and peaceful, allowing longer-term development to take root. Serbia and Montenegro provide solid examples of how such stabilization support can work.

For these reasons, the United States and other developed nations will continue to invest in the strategic capabilities necessary to combat instability and terror. Although I am confident this commitment will endure, stability operations face challenges to ensure they are sufficiently resourced to be effective, that is, to reduce the need for a military presence in unstable or stabilizing countries.

The Challenges Ahead

The stability operations industry must address several challenges. First is the U.S. government’s budgetary environment. Support for stability operations is divided among multiple budgetary accounts, departments and agencies. In addition, the U.S. government budget is constrained by the political environment and the recession, with most...
parties in agreement that budget deficits need to be reduced. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has made efforts to squeeze efficiencies out of the Pentagon’s budget by, for example, reducing orders for hardware designed for large-scale missions, which appears less necessary in an era of increased stability operations. Secretary Gates has framed the issue in a way that is fully compatible with U.S. diplomatic and development strategy, and offers protection to stability operations budgets from imprudent cutbacks.

But such an outcome cannot be assumed. Strategic needs are just one factor; another is a Congress that must respond to political exigencies. In this regard, we must note that many stability operations are managed by departments other than Defense, generally falling under the broad category of “foreign aid.” The foreign aid budget, rarely popular even in good economic times, may be vulnerable.

The second major challenge facing stability operations is communicating the strategic importance of stabilization activities to the newest decision-makers in Congress. Stabilization programs advance U.S. interests and help the poor in unstable societies to live better lives. Since 9-11, federal policymakers (including members of Congress and their staffs) have come to recognize the importance of stability operations — for which ISOA and its members deserve some credit. However, it is critical that new members of Congress and their staff — especially those who are already supportive of defense and national security — learn how stability operations are central to U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives.

The industry should communicate the importance of stability operations to intellectual leaders as well, such as those in the media and think tanks. The ability of economic, political and social development to markedly improve the lives of those who have fallen victim to destabilization results in many inspiring stories that speak directly to the United States’ desire to project itself as a strong and prosperous nation. Deliberate and patient stability and development operations, supported by the United States and the international community, are central to the new reality of conflict and the suffering it inflicts. While many people still think of the nations of the former-Yugoslavia in terms of the brutal ethnic and religious conflicts of the 1990s, the new reality is very different. Deliberate and patient stability and development operations, supported by the United States and the international community, were the key to turning the corner. More people should know this story.

**Performance and Accountability**

The final challenge to stability operations is perhaps the most important. The stability operations industry must work harder to improve their performance, accountability and standards. We must hire the best personnel, implement the most disciplined processes and operate according to best practices. Under conditions of instability, rules and authorities are in flux, and maintaining consistently high standards can be difficult. But we must maintain such standards to maintain the support of those we assist, those we work with and our donors.

Improving performance and accountability includes working with and through local authorities and personnel. In Afghanistan, IRD works with local leaders to both plan and implement road building, agriculture, healthcare and other projects. Over 90 percent of our staff in that country is Afghan, and they are learning vital skills, building vocational capacities and earning income to support their families and communities. Working with local authorities and employing local workers is the only way to quickly build capacity and turn a stability operation into a long-term development success.

In today’s world, stability operations are an integral part of statecraft. They help communities develop and sustain more peaceful and prosperous societies. It is important that successful stabilization efforts be communicated outside the stability operations industry. The more policymakers, intellectual leaders and the public understand the benefits of stabilization, the more likely it is that our “industry” will continue to deliver strong results for our donors, our national security interests and, most importantly, our beneficiaries.
As it exists today, the contingency contracting market is defined by uncertainty. Its function to provide life and mission support services in unstable environments bereft of political, legal, or economic systems has always existed in one form or another. Yet, today’s market is more intimidating than ever as U.S. policy re-examines overburdened commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan; local politicians exert self-sovereignty and crack down on contingency operations; and the public and media fail to separate amoral individuals from the neutral industry. However, the truth remains that these contingency contractor services are critical to U.S. foreign policy and provide “bookends in conflict.”

Too often, the topic of future market dynamics focuses on predicting the next crisis location and trying to be the first to respond. It is hardly an exact science, is rarely predictable and resembles something akin to “The Amazing Race.” One should instead focus on structural market changes, such as business models, customer-buying habits and competitor initiatives, which have a more lasting impact on the bottom line. The following three market dynamics will reshape the contingency contracting industry in the near-term.

We Are On the Verge of a “Last Supper”

In 1993, major aerospace and defense executives attended a summit at the Pentagon at which Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) leadership presented industry with a challenge of consolidation. Defense budgets were declining in the wake of the Cold War (according to the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, defense budgets declined at a rate of 3.1 percent compounded annually from 1985 to 1998), and the customer saw little value in supporting an overdeveloped industrial base. In the same way the heralded Lockheed Martin executive Norm Augustine cited that night as the “last supper” (and later penned in the article titled “The Last Supper, Revisited”), the contingency contracting market faces its own crossroads.

A services market that favors price over quality, low barriers to entry and is subject to a sudden, rapid increase in demand during the initial stages of conflict — like in Iraq and Afghanistan — has led to an oversaturated market. Furthermore, with buyer volume on the decline, firms are more willing to take risks in order to secure contracts, and to engage in low price shootouts in order to maintain what shaky foothold they may possess in the market. These trends do not create optimal value for the customer, or result in solutions that advance U.S. foreign policy objectives. With the inclusion of $159 billion in discretionary funding in Iraq and Afghanistan in the Department of Defense’s FY2011 budget request (22 percent of the entire DoD budget), a financial precipice can be seen in the not-too-distant future. [1] As the war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan wind down, just as the Cold War procurement was in its last throws in the late 1980s, industry consolidation is a necessary response to demand reduction.

An ancillary benefit of consolidation is that contractor behavior can be corrected. In the contingency services market, non-compliance, questionable ethics and risk acceptance undermine the delivery of service. For the U.S. government, monitoring and regulating an oversaturated marketplace is an increasingly challenging and costly endeavor. In order to take on these challenges of tomorrow, the customer needs to
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shape its partners of today. A market that is consolidated and shrinks by acquisition and natural selection will eliminate poorly performing firms whose prioritization of price over value negatively impact the U.S. mission.

Contract Vehicles for Multiple Customers

Counterinsurgency reshaped thinking inside the defense, diplomatic, and development establishments. Multidimensional approaches that balance kinetic force and soft power demand a seamless coordination of capabilities and management among multiple U.S. government entities and their partners. The ability to fight insurgents, implement reconstruction projects and stabilize and develop the community is a mission that falls on the shoulders of many stakeholders. Transitioning missions from defense agencies to diplomatic and development counterparts will require flexible contract vehicles that can span a variety of customers. This trend is beginning to emerge with contracts in Iraq and could expand further in Afghanistan.

If contract vehicles are tied to particular missions and objectives instead of to a particular customer, this could pose an interesting balance of benefits and drawbacks. For the customer, it leverages sunk costs and allows the U.S. government as a whole to tap into capabilities to support its mission. The ability of the defense, diplomatic and development establishments to tap into an existing pool of preselected contractors dedicated to a mission potentially maximizes operational efficiencies. From an industry standpoint, this trend could potentially press industry prices downward by concentrating buyer volume.

Additionally, unless the contracts are multiple-award vehicles, it could artificially restrict competition and leave the vehicle inflexible to new ideas, trends or suppliers. Whether or not this tradeoff results in an increase or decrease in quality of service is something that needs to be further explored, but using pre-qualified vendors should result in an improvement in quality. Ultimately, certain contract vehicles may be successful when implementing this model, but the trend could impact the industry in an adverse manner.

Opportunities for Innovation

Contractors bemoan the level of competitiveness in the industry. However, nothing is more important to the customer’s mission. To its own fault, the industry has failed to be as innovative as it can and has not fully explored the potential value of the services it provides. For instance, the immediate function of the contingency contractor is to provide a specific service. However, given the business model’s preference or stated requirement for employing locals and building capacity in host nations, contingency contracts may also act as a potential “second-front” in support of diplomacy and development.

According to the latest OSD figures, local Afghans account for 53 percent of the entire contracted workforce in Afghanistan. Furthermore, local nationals account for 33 percent of the entire contracted workforce in the U.S. Central Command Area of Responsibility countries (CENTCOM AOR) to the tune of 58,000 personnel, a number greater than the remaining U.S. troop level in Iraq. U.S. contractors employ many of these locals, which in essence functions as a major economic development program. Operating beyond the wire and/or in close business relationships with local nationals positions contractors to participate in nation-building at a deeper level. If the U.S. government were to further encourage it, there would be opportunities for contractors to provide additional services to enrich local prosperity.

From an industry standpoint, this concept would mitigate several negative market trends. It could create stimulated competitive advantage by encouraging a new vector for innovation, as long as the acquisition strategy recognized and compensated for it. As firms struggle to differentiate themselves from one another, receiving compensation for a value-add capability would incentivize innovation and could better justify the cost borne by the taxpayer. It also could reduce the relative ease with which incumbents are replaced for the next lower cost provider, and create new barriers of entry to firms looking to make a quick profit, forcing contractors to become vested in the interests of their supplier network — something critical to transitioning responsibilities to locals.

Of course, this concept needs to be further discussed in light of the use of third-country nationals in wartime environments. Third-country nationals, originating from places such as Latin America, Africa, and Asia, compose 40% of the overall DoD contractor workforce in CENTCOM AOR, totaling over 70,000 people. There is no exact number as to how many third country nationals have served as contractors worldwide, but one can only imagine the number of individuals returning home with either positive or negative opinions of the United States. This immense network of potential advocates or detractors of the American brand needs to be better understood so that U.S. efforts can be maximized.

For as many shortcomings as the contingency contracting industry has, there are an equal, if not greater number of benefits. All in all, the contingency contracting industry functions as a de facto mechanism of U.S. foreign policy. Policy planners in the U.S. government codify the industry’s existence in its formal planning processes. NGOs and development-oriented contractors push collaboration and form trade associations. Private equity firms buy up properties, insulating their portfolios from near-term market instabilities. While the industry continues to establish an air of permanence, most firms that operate within it do so without a thought to what the future may hold. Only by reacting to market dynamics, such as some of the ones outlined above, can the industry evolve to realize its true potential.

Endnotes

1. This number does not take into account the impact of these two wars on the defense base budget’s personnel and O&M accounts.
Getting Nation-Building Right

Developing new partnerships to build a better future

UNITED States foreign policy today pivots on three legs: defense, diplomacy and development, the three Ds. The balance is not always struck in equal measure: different missions hold different requirements and financial constraints tend to hinder the perfect balance. It is a delicate geometry, with nothing less than global stability and development bound up in the results. With that in mind, looming budget constraints and shifting national priorities will shake the three Ds’ balance at a critical time, when the planet is awash in epochal change—some of it peaceful and inspiring, some of it violent, awful and destructive.

We must insist that full accounting be done when the budget cuts come; that the price of cutting effective elements of foreign policy “investments” now is not a boom in global destabilization later, and thus the consequential diminishment of U.S. power around the world. Securing proper funding, and then deploying it effectively, is absolutely critical to preserving the United States’ role as world leader. Unfortunately, the environment we face is grim.

In his State of the Union speech in January, President Barack Obama noted the need for budget trimming. The new majority in the House of Representatives has claimed the mantle of government frugality and the race is on to see who will wield the budget axe most adeptly. In these circumstances, it is our duty to protect the necessary ingredients for an effective and successful foreign policy, and to help see ahead to even more effective strategies than those we now rely on. The key functions that allow the Department of Defense, with its lion-share role in our nation-building efforts, to stabilize war-ravaged zones; the governance and diplomacy functions performed by the Department of State; and the development, training and construction jobs organized by the US Agency for International Development, among others—these are the essential ingredients to an effective foreign policy, even if not always perfectly synchronized.

When the current foreign policy of defense, diplomacy and development takes on the challenge of stabilizing underdeveloped conflict and non-conflict zones, it relies on the coordinated efforts of three separate U.S. government agencies, oftentimes more. The organizations must collaborate to deliver a secure and prosperous environment where newly formed governments learn legitimate, democratic governance, while they rebuild infrastructure and patch back together the quilt of a foreign society torn apart. Creating a peaceful and self-sustaining society from the wreckage of war is a delicate process with a seemingly bottomless set of challenges; and sometimes the fractured nature of our foreign policy approach to this epic task risks fractured results. What if our approach actually hinders progress?

Today, U.S. government agencies operate overseas contract-by-contract, drawing funds from dedicated government and international donor streams. Because these funds are tied to individual agency projects, and not to an overall framework for success, our efforts sometimes miss the forest for all the trees. We risk creating dependent, infant governments to negotiate for the next project instead of a holistic plan for self-sufficiency. In a game of economic cannibalization, the newly formed governments will seek to fund their treasuries no matter what—even if it means heavily levying against foreign companies that perform the very development work meant to nurture a flowering local and self-sustaining...
This can quickly turn into a losing, zero-sum game of diminishing returns for the struggling host country as well as the United States and other nations committing genuine resources to the effort. The way to create a healthy economic engine for a developing nation is to pave the way for the creation of national industries and jobs, an effective education system and a civil, tolerant society. The development of national resources is an absolutely key ingredient in the recipe of a long-term recovery. Without the healthy fostering of a growing local economy, host countries will never acquire the basic government functions necessary to maintain a peaceful society.

Apart from the various moral and leadership questions at stake — which, to many, make for a compelling case on behalf of the mission to sustain temporary governance for the sake of the people stung by war and extremism — there are basic economic challenges to confront.

New governments must create self-sustaining economies to enable continued security, governance and stability independent of ongoing international aid. Practices of taxing contracting companies produce short-term revenue, which ends when the stability support-based contracts reach term — leaving the new government dependent anew. What’s more, taxing government contracting companies tends to pass higher costs to the government and can act as a double billing of the government as these taxes are passed along.

New governments do not have to follow best practices. Some foreign countries do not have to meet our regulations nor have they spent any of their resources doing the heavy lifting to create nascent economic opportunities. They do not have to be transparent and do not have to worry about being held accountable to Western standards. They do not have to answer for any of the myriad of issues that stem from the hard work of peace-making and nation building. These unregulated foreign entities do provide investment dollars that create opportunities for corruption. Consider the southern Iraq oil leases distributed to nations with no consideration for the efforts made about the way to stability. In Afghanistan, China has already won access to mining contracts, sweeping in to enjoy the opportunities afforded by the grueling efforts of others, namely the United States.

One answer is to mimic President Obama’s domestic plan for public/private partnerships. An internationally-focused public/private partnership (three Ps) could support international stability operations by working with government agencies to integrate the three Ds with the three Ps. Potential funding shortfalls for stability operations created by the worldwide economic downturn could be augmented by private dollars if the government supported a return on investment. This return on investment could be a post-conflict contract to develop natural resources if the private partner(s) participated in funding the necessary infrastructure projects early on.

This developmental opportunity and return on investment could be integrated into overall stability development operations, but would need to be coordinated by a centralized government entity with better visibility and control over the entire process. Imagine the efficiencies available by removing the bureaucratic red tape and stovepipes separating the distinct but interrelated functions of Defense, State and USAID in international development.

Critical will point to profits in conflict zones as reason alone to oppose this effort, but that is counterintuitive and destructive to the mission. The goal is to build a nation with a functioning, independent economy sustaining a free and tolerant society. Demonizing profits and revenue — the basic metrics of a functioning economy — undermines our national goals. In the very basic math outlined here, less spending and elbow grease in these categories equals more instability in more places for longer periods of time. It means more suffering for more people, more warlords and less peace — basically, it risks chaos. It will do far more than tarnish the United States’ reputation, and do worse than dent our pride. However, with sufficient transparency, oversight and accountability by a single government entity, public/private partnerships can succeed.

Foreign corporations that are not transparent (and therefore fall short of the 3D + 3P ideal) will rebuff international oversight. They will import their own skilled workers, fail to train a local workforce and extract natural resources without any long-term commitment to the mission on the ground. Organizations such as the International Stability Operations Association (ISOA) can play a part by providing a measure of oversight for members and becoming an advocate for global business and contracting standards. We can either work to improve the situation, or do nothing at all and watch our nation’s efforts and our own fall short of their capability.
The last ten years has seen the United States and other nations involved in war and conflict around the world. While operations to stabilize and then develop conflict areas have been ongoing for decades, there was exponential growth following September 11, 2001. While the effects of these conflicts have been devastating for many, born from these disparate engagements was the stabilization industry, which aims to refine and improve the way services and aid are delivered to harsh environments. Comprised of private sector companies — language and intelligence, security, logistics, training, medical, construction, professional services, NGOs and non-profits — this new industry has woven itself into the fabric of international affairs to offer its collective expertise in support of defense, diplomacy and development efforts. But will it stay that way?

In a new age of austerity for governments everywhere, decisions to engage in stabilization operations will be hotly debated. While conflicts care nothing for policy, decision-makers will have to be more selective about where and to what extent they engage. Governments will have the unenviable task of balancing the financial cost of future engagement against the tragic cost in lives and freedom for their inaction. The United States is well aware of the costs of blood, treasure and sometimes reputation. As the 2012 election cycle begins, political debates about U.S. and international interests will come to the fore. Arguments for isolationism, global engagements without troops or for a “long war” against radical ideologies will collide and have real ramifications for the stabilization industry. The international community will listen to these debates as their own realities change. The multiple transitions in the Middle East and the birth of a new nation in Africa – South Sudan – are examples.

Because of all of this, the stabilization industry will also have to figure out “what’s next” as coalition forces draw down in Iraq and NATO forces prepare to withdraw from Afghanistan by 2014. With this future, providing more services to the United Nations, European Union, NATO and the African Union are all potential opportunities.

The U.S. government continues to struggle with the role of the private sector in supporting national security and foreign policy. The Pentagon’s 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the State Department’s Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR) do not make great mention of the private sector. This represents a failure, in part, of the stabilization industry to effectively convey the value it brings. However, it also speaks to government efforts to define “inherently governmental” and associated functions in order to recover those positions; and at the same time, its attempts to discern true value from the stabilization industry in order to make the best acquisition decisions.

As an industry, we must make all investment necessary to communicate to all stakeholders the true cost of supporting both contingency and routine operations: what is in the realm of the possible, and what should stay in the fantasy of a well-written proposal. By doing so, we protect our integrity and raise the bar so that those who dramatically underbid the reality of the requirements in a request for proposal (RFP) to exploit “lowest cost, technically acceptable” and “best value” acquisition decisions without due regard for executing the contract with timely, positive results simply cannot win. Just as there is campaigning and governing in politics, there is bidding and executing in government contracting
and we all bear the responsibility to ensure acquisition officials and end-users have a clear understanding of what can actually be done at what cost in the most dynamic of environments.

Similarly, we must also protect ourselves and our collective integrity against those companies that use the Government Accountability Office (GAO) protest as a business development strategy merely to extend revenues gained from failing programs or to elicit sub-contracts from the winning team. It harms the entire industry’s reputation and drives source-selection boards and contracting officers to make sub-optimal acquisition decisions. If we fail at this, if we permit a race to the bottom, the entire industry suffers, as do those who desperately need our services. Market forces are meant to bring forth the solutions that best meet and exceed the challenges we face as a nation; and we must protect that market freedom at all costs. If we do not, unnecessary and uninformed regulation will result. Knowing bringing forth a C+ solution dressed up as an A because it can win a RFP beauty contest does not enable human freedom nor advance the defense, diplomacy and development missions we support.

Finding the right third-party certification process, one that is accepted by governments and international organizations, is paramount. We must at every turn set the bar high and ensure only those willing to invest in their companies and perform above reproach are permitted to provide services in support of missions and contracts that can cost lives.

As the world’s economies recover from the ongoing financial crisis, government budgets will shrink to recover. The Pentagon has already announced a $100 billion budget reduction. In the United States, the large industry players like Lockheed Martin, BAE and Northrop Grumman have choices. Because of their scale, they can choose to divest or acquire, but will have to be mindful of the government’s view of how those activities will affect the quality of the offerings of the resulting entities. The Pentagon wants increased competition, but it wants to ensure that competition yields better quality, too.

Private equity firms have a lot of money to invest. Lockheed’s announcement to sell PAE and Northrop’s sale of TASC to deal with organizational conflict of interest (OCI) challenges are efforts to divert distractions to their core work as competition increases and budgets decline. The recent acquisition of DynCorp by Cerberus Capital Management, KKR’s acquisition of TASC and the recent sale of Xe to Forte Holdings demonstrate clearly that investors see value in the industry. Innovative private equity firms will quickly move on deals to create the “next best prime” to compete with established companies and disrupt the status quo. These deals can be very profitable when investors can leverage economies of scale and find innovative leadership to drive these new entities to success.

Accountability will continue to be at the center of industry scrutiny. The Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) and the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) will spend much more time with “contingency contractors” and their business systems. Those without recent, completed audits will, at the least, find themselves subject to pre-award audits for accounting systems, but also to full-scope billing, estimating and purchasing-system audits. Of course, legal accountability will continue to be challenging, but will improve. While the stabilization industry continues to lead the way with solid codes of conduct and ethics and self-policing mechanisms, it is not enough for many. Engaging lawmakers and helping to shape responsible legislation will be important to ensure bad actors are held accountable and good actors have the flexibility to continue to contribute to regional, national and international engagement strategies in chaotic regions of conflict.

Impending budget constraints will demand that our industry find new ways to deliver value and measure performance beyond the confines of the contract and without additional cost to customers. Particularly, industry support to policymakers who report to Congress (and to Congress itself) the value of our efforts is essential to ensuring accurate performance information is available to everyone and to enhancing partnerships.

Finally, the stabilization industry must continue to adopt an open and transparent approach to our work. Hunkering down in the face of inquiries and investigations only causes one to miss the opportunity to logically and rationally educate stakeholders and document the realities of operations in conflict zones. We must continue to ask ourselves the hard questions about what we do and how we do it. We don’t make iPods or Cheerios; we support war-fighters, diplomats, development professionals, multi-nationals and civilians in harm’s way. With that comes a tremendous accountability to them as well as taxpayers and donors.

The stability operations industry must embrace business’ role in a good and just society. The honor associated with supporting national security and foreign policy brings with it additional responsibilities above and beyond that of traditional private sector operations. Without a clear and common industry moral compass by which to operate (even when nobody is watching), we cannot claim to enable human freedom or support those in poverty; we only invite unwarranted and uninformed scrutiny, and risk further damage to our industry’s reputation. We must set the standard high and hold ourselves accountable, while finding new ways to deliver value. We have it in our power to define how people see us, and the value we provide, and we should embrace every opportunity to demonstrate that.
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How the QDDR could save or sink post-conflict operations at State

The Future of S/CRS — What’s in a Name?

RELEASED in late 2010, the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR) put several issues within the Department of State (DoS) under the microscope. One important feature of the QDDR was the light shed on the State Department’s capacity to handle its presidentially-mandated responsibility for post-conflict situations. As such, the QDDR brought attention to the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS), attention the office had been sorely lacking since its inception. The QDDR promised significant reforms to S/CRS so as to bolster DoS’ capability to manage post-conflict stabilization. It needs to be considered, however, whether the QDDR’s scrutiny of S/CRS will succeed in transforming the neglected office, or if this attention is merely a passing trend. It is possible that renaming the office is enough to ensure that this new focus will successfully strengthen DoS’ aptitude for post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. If not, a much greater effort will be needed to realize the QDDR’s vision.

The Creation of S/CRS

The Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization in the Department of State (S/CRS) was created in 2004, but given formal direction in National Security Presidential Directive-44 (NSPD-44) in late 2005. S/CRS was created to solve the problems that arose from an earlier NSPD. NSPD-24, released in January 2003, was a formal handover of post-conflict responsibility to the newly-created Office of Special Plans in the Department of Defense (DoD). In many ways, NSPD-24 demonstrated a militarization of operations referred to as “Stabilization and Reconstruction,” or S & R. However, nearly three years later, NSPD-44 essentially reflected a negative assessment of DoD’s handling of S & R operations after NSPD-24, and re-assigned control of these exercises to the State Department. NSPD-44 expanded the responsibility of DoS, now charged with the duty to “coordinate and lead integrated United States Government efforts, involving all U.S. departments and agencies with relevant capabilities, to prepare, plan for, and consult stabilization and reconstruction activities.” [1] As such, NSPD-44 highlighted the importance of the nascent S/CRS, an office perhaps ironically championed by high-ranking civilians within DoD, tasking it with easing interagency tension in order to facilitate more cohesive planning for stabilization and reconstruction operations in the future. Much was at stake in the creation of and subsequent emphasis on S/CRS, as the office connects the lessons learned in Iraq and Afghanistan to future S & R exercises.

S/CRS was created in a climate hostile to its badly needed core mission. In many ways, the gesture of creating S/CRS could be seen as a tangible manifestation of deep abiding internal conflict within the administration at that time. This was readily apparent when Secretary of State Colin Powell and Deputy Secretary Richard Armitage did not support the creation of the office, as any modicum of foresight would have accurately predicted considerable problems in staffing and funding. This opposition conflicted with the goals of certain high-ranking civilians in the Pentagon, who believed the bureaucracy of DoS should not get any bigger and therefore did not initially see the same potential for problems. The chief advocate for the creation of S/CRS said in a private interview with the author in 2009 that, in retrospect, Powell and Armitage felt as if they were set up for failure, a sentiment given some...
credence by the facts. At its inception, S/CRS was only given a pittance of $17 million with a 37-person staff, compared to the 80 personnel requested, inviting magnanimous offers from DoD to fork over bodies and funding.

S/CRS was created to streamline interagency efforts for post-combat stability operations. It gives appreciable focus to training for civilian deployment to non-permissive environments, yet it must be considered that perhaps S/CRS was created in the Beltway strain of non-permissive environments. The office was theoretically designed to mitigate interagency tension, but in light of its initial budget and staffing misfires, did it succeed?

The Forgotten Office

Fast forward roughly five years. By summer 2010, S/CRS looked about the same as it did in 2005, in the interagency community as well as within the State Department itself, with the exception that there was even less mention of the office. Despite considerable overlap with other bureaus and offices, several at DoS were still unfamiliar with the office. State offices exist in a hierarchy of sorts, although this hierarchy is perhaps more imagined than real. To an extent, this hierarchy is determined, more or less, by the alleged “pertinence” of the office. It is hardly surprising that few would be familiar with the mission, or even existence, of S/CRS, when, as its former coordinator Ambassador John Herbst pointed out, “to date, S/CRS has not been given a principal role in any major crisis.” [2] S/CRS has never fully asserted its own voice in the interagency community whose tension it was supposed to reduce during planning stages for post-combat or post-disaster reconstruction. Further, S/CRS appeared on State’s organization chart as an “S” office, which in theory means the office should have operated directly under the Secretary of State. However, S/CRS has never had the prestige associated with such a label.

Indeed, perhaps the organization chart as of summer 2010 can be taken quite literally. In Foggy Bottom culture, perception is reality: S/CRS is represented on paper by a small bubble at the bottom of the organization chart, potentially reflecting its status in the State Department. In addition, S/CRS is housed in the farthest annexes of the State Department, in a similar reflection of its relevance. In large part, S/CRS functions like it coincidentally appears on the organization chart – the forgotten, off to the side, neglected office struggling to speak up from the sidelines in Springfield, Virginia.

Just as Powell and Armitage’s feeling of being set up for failure was confirmed by the meager staffing and funding S/CRS was given at its creation, the assertion that S/CRS is State’s forgotten office is given credence by its lack of evolution by the eve of the QDDR’s release. S/CRS is still charged with a disproportionate mission for its current funding — to “lead, coordinate, and institutionalize U.S. government civilian capacity to prevent or prepare for post-conflict situations, and to help stabilize and reconstruct societies in transition from conflict or civil strife, so they can reach a sustainable path toward peace, democracy and a market economy.” [3] Congress has been historically hesitant to appropriate funds for S/CRS, perpetuating S/CRS’ status as a blatantly underfunded and thus unacknowledged office.

Funding aside, the efficiency of S/CRS’ operations demands examination. Paltry funding is not the only reason S/CRS has run into walls trying to assert its presence in the interagency environment. S/CRS has been crippled by inefficient overlap with other bureaus and offices, as well as inefficiency in its own programs. For example, the pillar responsible for training has accurately identified the need to engage civilians in training programs prior to deployment to semi- or non-permissive environments. However, much overlap exists between these training programs and those run by regional bureaus for individuals deploying as members of Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs). Also, though these training programs are an excellent step in the right direction, they lack self-sustainability at best and overall cost-effectiveness at worst. The training is organized with the purpose of preparing a Civilian Response Corps, composed of active and standby members, but the CRC has hardly been used to the degree that it could have been, or perhaps should have been. The CRC’s nearly 1,200 members do excellent work throughout the world, but they have never been used as the primary mechanism for reconstruction assistance where a trained response corps was badly needed, for example, in Haiti in early 2010.

S/CRS and the QDDR

The long-anticipated Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR) was released in late 2010, and will have interesting consequences for S/CRS. The QDDR aims to bolster the competence of, and, hopefully, confidence in the State Department’s capability to effectively administer its post-conflict responsibilities. Essentially, the QDDR translates to a bulldozing of the organization chart. S/CRS will be stripped of “S” status and moved to the jurisdiction of the Undersecretary for Civilian Security, Democracy,
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JIPO: What are the greatest long-term challenges that the United Nations (UN) will face over the next decade?

Holmes: That is a big question! Every subject on earth is a priority subject for the UN system, in a sense. There are many major, fundamental challenges that the UN is going to have a key role in, like climate change, energy scarcity, water, food security, nuclear disarmament and so on.

I think that one huge challenge for the next ten years is the role the U.N. can play in stabilizing fragile states through conflict prevention, conflict mediation and peacekeeping. This whole mix of issues requires a well integrated approach. If you look at our experiences in Sudan, or in Congo, or most recently in Côte d’Ivoire, you can see that there are big challenges there about how to get the best leadership and the right coordination on the ground, in terms of providing basic security and reforming the security sector of countries, while at the same time providing jobs, and so on. This is a major challenge not just for the U.N., but for regional organizations like the African Union (AU), and sub-regional organizations like the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

To take an issue that I am even more familiar with, humanitarian response, we can see a lot of challenges there also. We need to look at whether the current system is well designed to deal with huge disasters like the earthquake in Haiti last year or the floods in Pakistan, which affected millions of people, and overwhelmed not only local governments but international organizations. I think we need to look at the probability due to climate change of more and greater disasters in the future, and how we are going to deal with them, for example by reducing the barriers between the humanitarian and development communities/worlds. In the future we will face more crises that involve not just a single factor, but a combination of disaster-producing factors — climate change, desertification, scarcities of water and land — where we have to deal not only with the immediate consequences of these factors, but also with long-term consequences, in terms of producing food security, better water management, agricultural investment, extra employment, and not least, rapid population growth.

JIPO: Drawing on your experiences as at the U.N. humanitarian chief, what were your greatest accomplishments and challenges?

Holmes: One thing I was able to achieve was to continue a process of reform, modernization and professionalization of humanitarian response. The tsunami of 2004-2005 was a wakeup call for the humanitarian community because the response was effective in some ways, but not as good as it should have been. Darfur in 2003-2004 was also a wakeup call in how to deal with conflict related issues. So as a result of those two seminal events, a process of reform was put in place: first, improve coordination within particular sectors —
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water, health, food, etc. — to make sure that there are no gaps or duplication and that there is a single organization responsible for ensuring that the response is good; second, improve cooperation between the U.N. and non-U.N. organizations because coordination and partnership are fundamental in the fragmented and diverse humanitarian community; third, improve leadership of humanitarian coordination on the ground by providing better trained and better qualified people; and fourth, make sure that the right kind of financial assistance is made available, particularly at the beginning of new crises or for crises which are neglected. The UN’s Central Emergency Response Fund was created for this purpose.

Those were reforms that were started just before I came on board in 2007. I saw it as my role to make sure that they were carried through and became part of international response. And I think that we achieved good results in all those areas. But that is not to say that the system is now perfect. In fact, it still remains very fragmented between many organizations. I think it remains to be seen how well the system can adapt to the prospect of new, major humanitarian challenges like Haiti and Pakistan in 2010, which have overwhelmed the system.

There is also a challenge in dealing with difficult political situations, such as those in Sudan or Sri Lanka or Afghanistan, where the host governments do not want their affairs poked into by humanitarian organizations, and therefore are inclined to try and restrict their activities. One fundamental issue there is how far humanitarian organizations should attempt to stay in these places, and at what point they should say that we must withdraw until our principles are respected by the government. The instinct is always to stay, to try to make sure that we can give the help which is so badly needed, but sometimes we may have to be tougher and more insistant on the right conditions and principles being respected by host governments.

**JIPO:** What is the virtue of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs cluster approach? Is the same framework or system supposed to work in such diverse situations as disaster relief and post-conflict reconstruction; or for operations in lower capacity states, such as Haiti, versus more middle-income countries, such as Pakistan?

**Holmes:** The cluster approach is part of the reform process put in place after the Indian Ocean tsunami to ensure that the sectoral response is much better coordinated. I think it has been successful, and I think the response in Haiti would have been even more difficult to mount if we had not had the cluster system in operation.

The cluster system is not a perfect approach to every response. Nor is it a one-size-fits-all concept. It may be more necessary in low-capacity states like Haiti and less necessary in countries like Indonesia, which has a much greater capacity to deal with its own disasters. One of the things we need to ensure is that the cluster system works closely with host governments and fits into their way of organizing things as well. Meanwhile, there always needs to be cross-sectoral coordination of some kind in place as well.

**JIPO:** Following the December 2004 Asian Tsunami, it was arguably local actors that had the most effective impact in disaster relief efforts. To what extent should the international community focus its efforts on helping to build local capacity and a sense of ownership?

**Holmes:** I think it is extremely important for the international community to build up local capacity. Local response is likely to be more effective, more culturally sensitive, more direct, and have more lasting effects than international response. So I think it is very important for us to do more than we have done in the past to increase not only the local capacity of governments, but also that of civil society — it is very important for big, international NGOs to do more to help smaller, local NGOs to increase their capacities. We also need to do more to reduce the risk of disasters before they happen, rather than focus too heavily on the response. Investing in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) should always be a better investment because obviously you are preventing deaths and damages, if you get it right, rather than just dealing with them after they happen. Having said that, there are clearly situations where the local government and civil society are overwhelmed by the scale of the disaster. What we need to ensure in these cases is that the international response is as effective, well-coordinated and well-directed as possible.

**JIPO:** In your view, what lessons can be drawn from the international response to the January 2010 earthquake in Haiti, which may be considered the greatest humanitarian catastrophe of the past couple generations?

**Holmes:** I think there are a lot of lessons we can learn from Haiti. The immediate humanitarian response, although a huge struggle, was overall reasonably successful in saving lives and providing the basics in terms of food, water, shelter, medical care and protection of the most vulnerable. Now we are in a rather different situation where reconstruction is very slow, so I think there are a lot of questions about how we can get out of the present difficulties.

Still, we need to perfect the cluster system to make sure it works even better in the future. Second, I think we need to be much more conscious of local sensitivities, needs and views. This is not a new criticism, but it was particularly tricky in the Haiti context because the capacity of the local government and other civil society organizations was so overwhelmed by the scale of the disaster that it was hard for them to get involved. Nevertheless, we must make every effort to involve local actors.

I think a third lesson is the importance of DRR and building up local disaster management capacity. We need to focus even more on these than in the past because then clearly deaths can be averted on a large scale, the preparation can be much better, and society can be much more resilient. If we compare what happened in Haiti with what happened in Chile, an even bigger earthquake a few weeks later, one can see the difference between badly prepared and well prepared societies. There are other lessons too, about the need to have a closer relationship with
Establishing mutually beneficial relationships with local national populations is often critical to private companies’ operational success in conflict and post-conflict areas — PAE credits much of its success to developing strong relationships with local nationals. Whether building peacekeeper base camps in Darfur or helping to train the new national army in post-conflict Liberia, our practice of hiring local labor has evolved into a strategy for developing capacity within the host country population. This strategy, which has been implemented successfully in Liberia, Djibouti and Afghanistan, among other countries, combines three key aspects of employee development and is implemented with the support of management teams.

Technical Training

Technical training is a common element among many stabilization missions and one of the most immediate methods with which companies can develop local capacity in host country populations. Whether the audience is a professional military group, such as the Armed Forces of Liberia, Sudanese People’s Liberation Army or Afghan National Army, or a group of civilian laborers, we have found that the first step in building local capacity is to provide technical training and mentoring sessions. Gaining skills through technical training programs increases the local workforce’s confidence and empowers the group to take ownership of projects once the contractor’s mission has concluded.

There are also significant benefits for the individual: once trained to meet one project’s standards, a local national’s professional marketability increases dramatically, making them better prepared to pursue additional opportunities to advance their professional standing. In Afghanistan, our program management teams have noted that several local national employees have pursued an entrepreneurial path after employment with companies such as PAE. After gaining technical training in vehicle maintenance and repair through our program, they were subsequently able to open their own vehicle repair shops in Kabul and the surrounding areas. Companies in the stability operations industry must think from a local perspective, and therefore show that their management teams are always striving to expand and develop their international workforce and provide opportunities for locals to make meaningful contributions to projects that will impact their country.

Our program management team in Djibouti recently created a local national internship program through which students at a nearby vocational school were able to refine their professional skills under the instruction of annex managers in various professional arenas, including carpentry, electrical work, vehicle maintenance and power generation. The vocational school was extremely pleased with the program and reported that the majority of students who had participated in the internship were able to find jobs soon after graduation. Offering free, hands-on training to select members of the local community was not only an important step towards addressing the gap in technical skills, it also strengthened the company’s relationship with the vocational school, making a favorable impression on the program customer and building a sense of corporate partnership with the local community.

Meg Manthey is a Communications Manager at PAE, Inc. Contact Meg at mmanthey@paegroup.com.
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Ethical Business Training

In addition to the obvious need for a technically adept workforce, companies should recognize the significant value of providing their workforce, including local national employees, ethical business training. Our Ethics and Business Conduct program is comprised of a series of interactive educational modules that explain the ethical and legal requirements of government contracting and how those requirements shape company policies and our expectations of all employees. The ethics booklet is translated into over 13 languages, and ethics awareness posters, which encourage employees to call the toll-free and anonymous ethics phone line should they have any questions or concerns, are visible at all sites. In certain environments, where booklets and posters are not an effective means of communication, site managers adapt as necessary to engage employees in training: gathering in a dining hall or under the shade of a tree to discuss employee expectations, or acting out scenarios to demonstrate consequences of inappropriate behavior.

Our goal is to establish a common understanding across the many countries in which we operate and across all levels of our workforce of the company’s expectations for professional behavior.

This training is particularly critical for local national employees because their employment with us may be their first professional experience or, more importantly, the first time they will be held accountable to policies based on the U.S. Federal Acquisition Regulation requirements. This training serves the interests of both the company and the individual employee as it mitigates the company’s risk of contract violations based on local infractions, and increases the employee’s value as a technically skilled individual with the business acumen necessary for advancing to a management role.

Beyond training the local national employees, interactive discussion sessions on business ethics help the company to identify areas of common cultural misunderstandings and proactively address issues that may arise between a local national staff member and American national or third country national management team. Though some adaptations may be necessary to make training modules relevant to the local populations and the jobs they perform, we have found that taking the time to demonstrate our company culture, sense of business ethics and responsibility to local national employees helps establish a sense of partnership and trust.

Career Development

Once employees complete training and are expected to begin applying those lessons to their work, program managers observe the workforce carefully for those with potential to take on new positions and/or leadership opportunities within the company. Like all companies, our goal is to make a return on the resources we invest in our workforce and retain top talent whenever possible in order to develop a leadership pipeline for our programs. Towards the end of a mission, program managers will attempt to place successful employees in other programs to provide opportunities for continued employment after project demobilization.

One particularly successful example of this practice involved a local national employee from Darfur. He so impressed his colleagues and management team with his enthusiasm for professional opportunities and personal development that he was re-hired as a third country national to support another project in Liberia. Not only did this allow him to financial support his family, he also gained new technical skills as a logistics manager, used his free time to study for a high school equivalency test and volunteered at a local orphanage. By the time his second project drew to a close, he had qualified for a scholarship to attend college in the United States. He is currently enrolled as a freshman at the University of Rochester and is committed to return to Sudan following the completion of his studies to work towards the promotion of peace and/or sustainable economic development.

Companies should invest heavily in the development of their employees, as providing challenging opportunities and rewarding careers is in the best interest of both the individual employee and the company. Once identified, local national leaders can play an important role in establishing a relationship between the company and the local government and community at large: certainly by leveraging connections to community leaders, but also through their knowledge of the region’s customs and protocols. By fostering local national employees’ leadership skills and elevating them to management positions, companies can gradually increase the capacity of the local workforce and prepare it for independent operation, with a hierarchy of local leaders in place to lead...
The Afghanistan Transition

A road yet to be traveled

At the November 2010 NATO Summit, the Allies agreed that "Afghan forces [would] be assuming full responsibility for security across the whole of Afghanistan by the end of 2014." While a seemingly distant objective, it is not too early for private sector contributors to consider how the move to an Afghan-led campaign will affect them. Indeed, although the Allies set the 2014 target date, the handover could come earlier depending on the ability and will of the Afghans to take greater control and the desire in NATO capitals to relinquish control.

Undoubtedly, several nations will choose to pull out before 2014 — the Netherlands has already done so. Although the Dutch government subsequently decided to return to Afghanistan this year, its role is strictly limited to sending trainers to relatively safe province of Kunduz. Indications are that Canada also intends to end its combat role this summer, but is aiming to provide about 950 trainers later this year. The United States plans to begin withdrawing some forces this July (a decision reiterated in the president's State of the Union address), although the numbers are unclear. With popular support for the Afghan mission declining and Congress looking for places to cut the deficit, there could be many on Capitol Hill who will argue for an accelerated departure from Afghanistan on political and financial grounds. However, the ability to withdraw will depend on whether there are sufficient trained Afghans ready to shoulder the burden.

The Afghan attitude toward transition is complicated. Some regional Afghan leaders worry about a decline in security once the Allies leave; others fear that the lavish flow of western funding will dry up as the Allies shift to a supporting role. Some Afghan leaders, particularly those less comfortable with the Allied presence in general, are no doubt eager to get NATO forces out of the way, whether it is so they can pursue their own agendas or due to the understandable skepticism of any extended international presence. To Afghans interested in the former, the NATO presence has been bad for business -- be it smuggling, drug trafficking or simply wielding unfettered political power. For his part, President Hamid Karzai himself laid out the objective of having security in Afghan hands by the end of 2014. No doubt he is reassured by signals from Washington and other capitals of an enduring security relationship thereafter, but recent reports from Berlin and London suggest that the 2011 start date for withdrawals and 2014 handover completion date are gaining a strong constituency in Allied capitals.

The Transition Process

Three elements need to come together for an orderly and timely transition. First, the key players — in this case, the troop contributing nations and the Afghan government — need to agree on the criteria and process for the handover. Work on this task is well underway. Second, there must be a viable system for securing the countryside, either by having the Afghan National Security Force (ANSF) replace NATO forces or by empowering the local population to handle its own security where the ANSF presence is not scheduled to remain. Lastly, there must be a sustainment plan to ensure that the residual local or ANSF forces can support themselves. This final element is complex and requires a longer discussion in a future article.

A new body known as the Joint Afghan-NATO
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Securing the Countryside

The NATO Training Mission-Afghanistan (NTM-A), led by Lieutenant General Bill Caldwell and Dr. Jack Kem, has been making huge strides in preparing the ANSF for the inevitable day when the Afghans will have to take charge of the entire security mission. The next two years will see an enormous surge to the tune of $20.9 billion in new funding for ANSF construction, training and infrastructure. These large investments have strong bipartisan support in Congress as they are inexorably linked to the future withdrawal of NATO forces.

The near-term priorities are increasing the ANSF's combat forces and uniformed police, but the pressure to get more ANSF into the forefront creates a dilemma for General Caldwell. As the ANSF grows larger and more complex, the demands on the institution will require higher-level skills, better training and better-educated personnel. The initial efforts to build up the critical enablers (e.g., transport, logistics, intelligence, medical) are already underway but Caldwell readily acknowledges this is just the beginning. If the ANSF is going to be ready for transition on a large scale, it is quickly going to have to become far more self-sufficient. This may be yet another area where the private sector may be called upon for assistance.

One example is in regards to transportation. The ANSF is getting rid of its crude, but easily-repaired, Soviet-era vehicles in favor of HUMMV's and Ford Rangers. While both are superb vehicles, they require a computer to diagnose any problems, which requires a higher degree of literacy that most Afghan recruits receive in their initial training. NTM-A is cognizant of this gap and is already providing mandatory literacy training for all ANSF recruits.

Or is higher literacy actually required? Can standardized pictograms and other non-alphabetic means be used to display information to guide the soldier to a solution and to check the result? The same approach might be applied to intelligence analysis, to logistics, or inventory control. With Congressional belt-tightening destined to include even NTM-A at some stage, it is likely that simpler, cheaper solutions will find a sympathetic audience both at NTM-A and on Capitol Hill.

The Elephant in the Room

There is one key weakness that has been consistent up to the present: the lack of trainers. NTM-A has sought more countries to fill its requirement for 2,800 personnel, but a gap of more than 700 remains and will grow rapidly as the level of NTM-A's effort increases. While numerical ANSF goals will probably be met even with the shortage of trainers, the quality the ANSF needs in key specialties can only be assured if the full quota for trainers is met. Again, this seems to be another area where the private sector may participate.

The ANSF's enablers will undoubtedly remain in Allied hands for some time. But as the West's combat role winds down and political interest and support wanes, the demands on Afghans will grow. By pursuing pragmatic solutions now to the support challenges that lie ahead, the private sector could contribute in a very tangible way to the success of the shift to Afghan-led operations.

The author received valuable suggestions from ISAF and NTM-A, but the views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Defense University, the U.S. Government, NATO, or the NTM-A.

Endnotes

2. "Integal" is the Dari word for "transition," Dari being one of Afghanistan's widely-spoken official languages.
Six years have passed in Sudan since the signing of the 2005 peace agreement ended a twenty-year civil war in which two million people were killed and over four million were displaced in a nation with little or no medical care for its people. The clinics in South Sudan were few and far between, had little or no equipment or quality medication, and were staffed with overworked and underfunded medical professionals. It was not uncommon for the sick and injured to walk for two or three days to see a doctor. In an environment that is rife with malaria, typhoid, parasites, deadly snakes and a host of other diseases, Sudan continues to suffer from some of the highest mortality rates in the world.

The lack of access to quality healthcare has impacted both the Sudanese and the internationals living in South Sudan, creating a crisis situation when one becomes sick or injured. However, things are slowly changing. The end of the civil war has brought back many professionally trained former refugees who are now leading the charge to improve basic health services. Recently, oversight and regulations of medical providers have been implemented, and credentials and licenses are now required to provide medical care, thus assuring patients that anyone calling themselves a medical doctor has actually received a medical degree.

Over the past few years, through the efforts of NGOs and other private organizations, medical clinics have spread throughout rural South Sudan. Some of these clinics are converted houses, while others are little more than sheds constructed of corrugated steel, with a dirt floor, no running water or electricity, and little medication. These clinics offer the first line, and many times the only source, of care for the rural people of South Sudan. These clinics have continued to evolve and multiply, though not as quickly as the country’s need, as poor infrastructure hinders expansion efforts. During the wet season it is not uncommon for airstrips and roads to be unusable for weeks or months at a time. Still, operating clinics see more than 300,000 patients a year.

In Juba, South Sudan’s largest city, the availability of comprehensive care is only slightly better. Since the peace agreement it has become the center of government, progress and expansion in South Sudan, with a population boom of 160,000 in 2005 to an estimated 1.4 million today. Modern shops, office buildings, and houses are springing to life. However, most of the residents still live in family compounds with houses constructed of mud and straw. As with other cities throughout the developing world, Juba’s rapid growth has led to an increasing sanitation problem. In addition to permanent residents, new “villages” filled with internally displaced people pop up daily. The inhabitants of these “villages” live in close confines in shelters constructed of bamboo and polypropylene tarps. Proper drainage and septic fields are non-existent, and the resulting contamination is quickly becoming a source for widespread disease.

Based on U.S. standards, such as those outlined by the American Medical Association in 2008, a city of 1.4 million inhabitants requires five thousand doctors. This ideal ratio of one doctor for every three hundred people clashes sharply with the reality in Juba where there are less than one hundred Sudanese doctors and a few international medical providers working at a handful of clinics and hospitals. The clinics have little equipment and even less medication with
which to treat the over 200 people that visit them daily. There are only four x-ray machines in the entire city. Advanced diagnostic equipment, EKGs, defibrillators and the blood labs are equally scarce.

For the international worker in Juba, becoming ill or injured is a serious concern and the consequences of waiting can be deadly. The past course of action for even minor illnesses has been a flight to a Kenyan or Ugandan hospital. Recently this has begun to change with the opening of a number of private clinics. In 2006, Unity Resources Group opened its first clinic with international levels of medical care. South Sudan’s first public Level III Blood Lab opened in 2010, which has allowed more illnesses and chronic conditions to be accurately diagnosed, monitored and rapidly addressed in South Sudan. Most injuries or illnesses can now be treated in Juba. However, some patients are still referred to regional hospitals for levels of illness that are beyond the ability of local health providers. Referral and onward movement is seldom simple. Juba International Airport has no runway lights and aircraft are not legally allowed to land or take off after six o’clock each evening. Any aircraft not on the ground by four o’clock is likely to be staying until the next day. If a patient is to be transported on the same day of a serious incident, the injury or illness must be reported and an aircraft ordered by noon.

Despite complexities involved in providing medical care in isolated environments, very few international organizations have reviewed their health support requirements, and even with the existence of duty of care obligations, still fewer have a robust plan for dealing with chronic illness and injury. International organizations in Southern Sudan should ask themselves a series of simple questions:

- Do I have a current locally-regionally focused medical treatment and evacuation plan?
- How will the patient be stabilized on site so he or she will live long enough to get to a higher level of care?
- Has the medical treatment and evacuation architecture been tested?
- Has this been formally communicated to all staff to ensure wide awareness?
- Does the medical provider understand our protocols for dealing with emergencies?
- Has our medical provider been provided with every employee’s medical profile including family and medication history?

While this is all being initiated in Sudan, coordination efforts should simultaneously take place between the employer and their medical insurance company. Many times the insurance company with which organizations and/or individuals work have little to no working knowledge of Africa or the unique Sudanese environment, which creates complications and lengthens the time it takes for patients to get lifesaving care.

For example, recently an international worker was injured in an accident that left him with a fractured spine. His company’s medic quickly stabilized him, help was called, and a helicopter was dispatched. However, it did not arrive until nine hours later. Unfortunately, once the patient finally arrived in Juba, it was too late to fly him out of the country, and he had to be held overnight. While the patient was in the air traveling to a Kenyan hospital the following day, his European-based insurance company decided to redirect him to their preferred hospital facility, unaware that the facility was closed to advanced care for the weekend. When the patient arrived at the facility he was admitted, but had to wait an additional thirty hours before receiving treatment. The patient eventually had surgery and was transported back to his home country for the remainder of his medical care.

Such cases, in which errors and assumptions delay care and jeopardize the patient’s life, demonstrate the need for due diligence at many levels. When illnesses or injuries occur in isolated environments, time is of the essence. Malaria can go from mild to life threatening in a single day. The likelihood of recovery from a major trauma or injury decreases exponentially with every hour that passes. In order to ensure that ill and injured workers in isolated environments receive care as quickly as possible, companies should perform due diligence checks on the following:

- What are the terms of your medevac insurance policy? What are your rights? What are the insurance company’s responsibilities? Can the health insurance company override the medical provider’s decisions on care?
- Where are the regional evacuation hospitals? What is required to transport someone to the facility? Does the insurance company have an ongoing relationship with the regional evacuation center?
- What are the capabilities of the regional centers? What are their access policies?
- What are the procedures to ensure that your medical provider and insurance company communicate directly?
Thanks to a group of conscientious governments, contractors and civil society groups, the International Code of Conduct (ICoC) was finalized in November 2010 as a set of good-practice principles for private security contractors. The human rights community sees a lot of promise in these principles, not least because civilians harmed on the battlefield might finally have their losses recognized and properly addressed.

Most promising is the impending creation of an oversight and governance mechanism — or more simply, a watchdog to monitor what contractors who sign onto the ICoC are doing right and wrong. That hard work will be done over the next 18 months by a committee. Their discussions so far have focused on what should happen to rogue contractors, from concerns about domestic murder laws and investigations, to criminal liability and prosecution. This committee, though, will only get the job half right if they do not also focus on what the victims of contractor violence will receive for their hardship.

Some civilians become targets of rogue contractors, while others get caught up in the crossfire. It is easy to focus only on the former, because the solution is easy: a contractor has obviously violated not only the ICoC, but also domestic and international laws. Any redress mechanism set up by the committee will likely include putting those laws to use through legal claims and reparations for damages.

But what of victims killed, wounded or otherwise harmed by contractors in situations where no one is legally at fault? The ICoC must take into consideration the needs and expectations of all survivors, including those harmed when the battlefield turns to chaos. It would be a shame to overlook an entire cadre of war victims, as the laws that govern warfare already do.

An amends process for these victims should be explicitly embedded into the ICoC. Put simply, contractors should begin collecting data, review claims of harm and pay compensation when appropriate. Some of the key issues to consider include what constitutes amends for harm; liability fears of particular concern to the contracting community; and how to marry such a principle of making amends to victims with practical solutions on the ground.

Some militaries and contractors are already recognizing and responding to unintentional civilian suffering, despite no legal obligation to do so. The United States military, which recognizes an obligation to abide by the Laws of Armed Conflict, allows its commanders a discretionary fund from which they can pay a condolence (a symbolic gesture of regret) for civilian deaths, injuries and property damage inflicted during legitimate combat operations. The typical amount for a death or injury in Iraq and Afghanistan is $2,500 — a low figure, but nevertheless worthwhile. Again, these are payments made outside any legal framework.

Security contractors are not part of the military chain of command, so they do not have access to military funds like these. Still, many firms did pay compensation in Iraq. U.S. counterinsurgency doctrine applies whether you were a soldier or a contractor: every victim who receives amends represents a chance to bolster relations with the locals, decrease terrorist recruitment and create a safer operational environment.
Architects of the ICoC oversight mechanism have a chance to build on and incorporate lessons learned from these amends efforts — from proactive, culturally appropriate overtures to village elders after a tragedy, to respectfully providing civilians with information about what happened to their loved ones and tangible compensation for losses.

When a contractor is tied to a warring party — whether to its military or to a civilian agency — investigations, payments and negotiations with victims’ families can be coordinated. The Department of State recommended prompt offers of condolences to civilians killed or seriously injured in Iraq and reportedly approved over $132,000 in such payments in 2007. The Department of Defense on occasion paid compensation for harm their contractors caused, informally bringing them into the military chain of command. This was not a policy spanning all agencies involved in Iraq, nor did the U.S. government commit American taxpayers to covering all civilian harm caused by contractors, so some victims received help while far more did not.

Going forward, contractors tied to a military force should coordinate efforts and ensure every civilian harmed receives the same treatment. Contractors not affiliated with a military force or those affiliated with a branch that does not make amends should make an effort to create a standing company policy for tragic situations, if and when they happen.

So why not simply require a civilian compensation provision in every contract inked in support of an armed conflict? The answer I continually hear is that contractors fear liability for inadvertent civilian harm. To wit, most of the contractors that pay compensation do so under-the-table because Western courts might use such payments to prove admission of guilt. Even if such cases are eventually thrown out for lack of wrong-doing, a contracting company could spend 500 times as much to defend itself in court as they would have offered in compensation to the family.

If, however, signatories to the ICoC agreed to accept claims of harm, proactively conduct investigations and provide immediate, tangible amends to all civilians they unintentionally harm, such payments or other dignifying gestures would more likely be seen as a desire to recognize and assist civilians — a routine matter of common policy, not an immediate indication of guilt. That said, no provision of amends should negate a victim’s legal recourse for wrong-doing by the contractor under domestic or international laws.

Human rights advocates want civilians harmed by contractors to get the full spectrum of justice owed them. Even now, too many civilians whose rights have been violated by contractors receive nothing. But civilians harmed by run-of-the-mill combat operations, and thus overlooked by domestic and international mechanisms of redress, shouldn’t also be overlooked by the ICoC.

One idea put on the table by ICoC negotiators is an independent global complaint mechanism that would accept claims of harm filed by civilians, host governments and civil society. To ensure it benefits all victims, the mandate should include acceptance of claims for harm contractors have unintentionally caused civilians, and a procedure to investigate and provide timely amends for that harm. Furthermore, implementation of the complaint mechanism’s decisions must ensure some promise of accountability for the victim, lest the effort ring hollow to civilians who receive nothing in return for their losses.

Finally, while the ICoC’s job is to set out the principles by which contractors should dignify civilian harm, contractors also have a duty to implement those principles appropriately on the ground with their own creative and effective ideas for self-reflection and accountability. For example, since companies are often required by contract to immediately depart a combat scene, civilians cannot identify the contractors who harmed them, nor do contractors have the opportunity to conduct their own investigations. Some contractors in Iraq proposed marking all their vehicles with large identification numbers, which when combined with force tracker-records, could give civilians evidence to file a claim of harm. While the idea never made it to the streets of Baghdad, this kind of practical solution is exactly what contractors themselves can do to bolster accountability. Such solutions could facilitate the work of the complaint mechanism and ensure real follow-up takes place to address the complaint and make amends for the harm.

The ICoC must not only seek to prevent future harm, but dignify those who are harmed when protection fails. No matter what mechanism comes out of these next months of discussions, it must ensure accountability beyond only egregious contractor behavior. It must seize this opportunity to ensure that contractors also make amends to civilians who they unintentionally harm, not leave them to suffer the absence of any real recognition or amends.
alternative activities when their original projects have concluded.

Corporate Support

While project management must cultivate most relationships with local nationals and build community partnerships at the site level, companies must maintain a similar mindset at the corporate level as well. For example, company newsletters should feature regular profiles on employees from program locations and advertise open positions around the company to encourage employees to extend their career with multiple projects. Special recognition programs should include local national candidates to highlight the significant ways in which they contribute to the organization as a whole, and also to incentivize employees to seek continued employment once they have satisfied their initial contract.

Philanthropy programs can be structured with a focus on the local level to ensure that charitable giving is directed to where it will have the most impact and to where it will best establish a company’s presence as a corporate partner. Whenever possible, management teams must try to communicate the value of their local national employees and impress upon them the company’s intentions to create true, mutually beneficial partnerships.

PAE works to enhance stability and build capacity in developing areas, and to assist weakened civil institutions until they are self sufficient and not reliant on foreign involvement. What better way to accomplish this goal than by reaching out to the local labor pool from the start and becoming a trusted partner in the community? What better way than to nurture relationships with high achievers from the local community and provide opportunities for continued employment and professional development? Local nationals serve as invaluable sources of on-the-ground information and local know-how. Contractors can benefit from advanced warnings of brewing tensions in the community that may later become security concerns, and from local advice on topics ranging from what precautions should be taken for annual monsoon seasons to what vendor supplies the best concrete.

Cultivating partnerships within a community not only helps contractors complete their work on a better tactical level, but also helps to attract and retain top talent and establish a corporate presence. As a general practice, it makes good business sense and, by preparing the local population to self-perform key development activities, contributes to our customers’ strategic goal of developing local capacity.

Endnotes

What level of care can your medical provider offer? When is it necessary to move to a higher level of care?

Even when this has all been done there is still the possibility that things will go wrong. However, the likelihood is significantly less. The ability to show due diligence also offers a level of protection in the event of litigation.

Many international organizations mistakenly believe that because South Sudan does not have the same security issues as Afghanistan or Iraq that it is a benign country. To the contrary, the local environment contains many hazards that make Sudan equally as dangerous as other countries in which private companies and organizations operate.

If the appropriate cautions are given, living and working in South Sudan is a wonderful experience. International companies and organizations have the opportunity to help its transformation into the world’s newest autonomous democracy. However, their capacity to help will be diminished if they do not do the necessary due diligence and planning. It is imperative that any international organization operating in South Sudan has a comprehensive medical plan in place that takes into account the risks associated with doing business in such environments. Only then can the private sector truly help the Sudanese people realize their potential.
How can we evaluate Africa’s progress over the past ten years? Is the cup half full or half empty?

Looking at the financial newspapers lately, one sees lots of optimism about Africa. The continent is a great place to make money. Overall growth is between 3.5 and 6 percent per annum. There is a rising middle class with purchasing power. More and more Africans with spare cash for shopping. Walmart, the largest American supermarket chain, has acquired the South African equivalent with stores in 12 African countries. This is significant.

China and India are expanding their economies at a rapid rate as they both quickly devour mineral and agricultural commodities. This is resulting in a lot of money for a significant number of African countries that export oil, basic minerals and agricultural products. China, India, Australia and Canada, among others, are investing heavily in extractive industries throughout the continent. An increasing number of African governments are trickling down a modicum of commodity wealth to their populations, although there is still a considerable way to go in overcoming the infamous “resource curse.”

In the political arena, most African countries are a lot more open since the year 2000. Opposition parties exist and are quite lively. The press is often free, animated and getting away with more and more criticism of those in power. The explosion of portable phone ownership in sub-Saharan Africa has made it harder for governments to engage in censorship or secrecy. Civil society groups can communicate with their members and can mobilize action with far greater expediency and impact than in the past. More and more elections are receiving the “free and fair” seal of approval from international and local observers. Two-term mandates are resulting in more and more heads of state being replaced. There are even a couple of countries where the incumbent heads of state accept the risk of losing an election.

So, shall we rejoice? Is it time to pop a magnum of champagne in honor of Africa crossing the thresholds of sustainable economic growth and irreversible democratic transition?

There is a division of opinion on this question. As for me, I am of the opinion that the glass is still half empty.

Why am I coming down on the negative side?

First, outside of South Africa, I do not see much in the way of Africans producing value-added wealth. Agricultural exports continue to be way below what they were during colonial times. With the current rise of food prices (due to the rising consumption of Asian and Latin American middle classes), Africans are facing a major crisis of food imports eating up all their purchasing power. Africa should be able to feed itself and export surpluses, but unfortunately it faces the reverse. President Barack Obama’s high priority foreign aid program called “Feed the Future” is designed to make Africa self-sufficient in, as well as a major exporter of, food. There is a long way to go to get there, but the President’s decision is right on target.

Where are the factories that make garments and low cost household items? Nowhere, because Chinese exports undercut local production. African governments need to protect infant
industries, instead of allowing them to be crushed by China and India. Without the U.S. African Growth and Opportunity Act program, African export production would be even lower than it is now.

What about poverty reduction? From the year 2000 to today, poverty levels have gone down from 60 to 50 percent approximately. This is a fine decrease, but levels are still far higher than they should be. This means that the rise of a new middle class is not expanding to the majority of people in the rural areas, who in most countries continue to live on less than two dollars a day.

In the political realm, African societies continue to become more open and more transparent — there has been a steady improvement over the past ten years. However, democracy and good governance have been improving at a snail’s pace. The oil producing countries continue to be constipated with respect to using their large revenues for infrastructure, health program, better education and the modernization of agriculture. Instead, much of the revenues are being invested outside of Africa for the benefit of ruling elites. Let us hope that the rising new mineral revenues will be handled differently.

Internal conflict has diminished, which should be recognized as a major accomplishment. The end of the 30-year Sudan civil war is a major achievement for which the United States government deserves some credit. The African Union, with its Peace and Security Council, has grown in its capacity mediating and negotiating force that aims to prevent and end conflicts. As of early 2011, only two major conflicts continue in Darfur and Somalia.

Yet, democracy has yet to flourish in Africa. The current crisis in Côte d’Ivoire, in which the previous —or should I say current — head of state Laurent Gbagbo refuses to accept defeat in a U.N.-certified free and fair election, illustrates some basic issues standing in the way of true democracy. Where there is an absence of social capital and thus one major ethnic group cannot envisage living under the rule of another elections have no meaning. Furthermore, the African Union is a club of heads of state who protect each other’s interests. When does the Union become outraged? When a sitting head of state, a member of the brotherhood, is overthrown in a coup. However, when that same man rejects an unfavorable election result, there is a big yawn with the benefit of the doubt going to the incumbent — a coup from the top, so to speak. This is what is happening in Côte d’Ivoire today. President Gbagbo has lost, but his constitutional council says that he really won. “Who is the U.N. to contradict a government’s own procedures?” argue some very important African heads of state.

This leads to what I will refer to as Ambassador Cohen’s First Law of Democratic Transition in Africa: If an incumbent head of state has decided he does not want to lose an election, he will not lose. So far, the only country where incumbents accept the risk of losing, and actually lose from time to time, is Ghana.

For all this pessimism, good governance is on the rise. There are a number of authoritarian African governments that, although their heads of state will never lose an election, are practicing good governance; there are countries where corruption is diminishing and the flow of revenue is transparent. It might be appropriate, therefore, to redesign our democracy/good governance programs to give more weight (and resources) to governance, and less to democracy, a process that will advance at its own slow pace from the depths of the populations.

What can we hope for and expect between now and the end of 2020? In my view, three entities will enter the take-off zone. These include (1) the Ghana, Togo, Benin coastal trio, (2) the Southern African Customs Union (SACU: South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland Namibia, and adjunct member Mozambique) and the East African community (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi). As for the others: until the four giants: Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Angola and Sudan, can get their acts together to capitalize on their potential, continued stagnation will be the rule.

So, the bottom line for Africa’s ten-year progress report is hold the champagne, but raise a vitamin water toast to those few countries that are gearing up for the big push into the big time.

---
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needs and international peacekeeping efforts.

When ISOA was launched ten years ago, the industry was just achieving “self-recognition.” Its scope of services was largely limited to logistics, construction, explosive ordnance disposal, aviation and security. Today, the scale and diversity of the industry has vastly expanded to include communications, fleet management, capacity building, information technology, language services, medical support, recruitment and human resources and all sorts of training and security sector reform services. Many companies and non-profits have evolved to provide “state building” services that help create long-term solutions for weak and failed states. An identifiable class of “supporting organizations” has sprung up, indirectly working for the missions by offering members everything from accounting to legal services and other services not employed in the field, but increasingly vital to a mature and sophisticated industry.

The industry’s challenges have changed as well, with problems ranging from the mission specific, such as apparently arbitrary Afghan tax laws, to the strategic, such as the definition of inherently governmental functions and the International Code of Conduct for Private Security Providers. The budget crunch has forced a reassessment of how stability operations will be carried out in the future and whether the central role that militaries play in peacekeeping missions is appropriate or cost effective compared to relying more on civilian resources and leadership. ISOA will continue to play a central role as the industry’s unified voice, and advocate for improved international operations through enhanced utilization of ethical private services.

The U.N. mission in Sierra Leone was a long time ago and it was, albeit ugly, successful. The international community must learn to improve stability operations. There have been many improvements and ISOA has been an active partner representing the private sector. Although many policy makers rail against future involvement in such missions, in fact there are already more stability operations on the horizon, and it is incumbent on a humane world that we do them better than we did in the past.
Three hundred and fifty years of British involvement in India have been summed up in six words: “We traded; we conquered; we governed.” [1]

And until 1858, this trading, conquering and governing was done by a private corporation, the East India Company, which from 1772 exercised virtual sovereignty over a substantial and consistently expanding part of the subcontinent. The East India Company was a government in all but name. It maintained its own army and navy. It collected taxes and preserved customs barriers. It minted coins and printed stamps. It codified the criminal law, and tried and punished offenders. And in its final years, it started to lay down the public infrastructure — roads, railways and irrigation systems — necessary to support a modern economy.

From the 1830s, the Company had no business in India other than to govern, meaning that in the later years a private corporation under a franchise granted by the British Parliament effectively administered most of modern India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. If we measure the scale of a government in terms of its tax revenues, Britain was only around three times the size of the confederation of states governed by the East India Company. If scale is determined by the numbers of those governed, then this privately-managed government was ten times that of the British Crown.

The shift from trading to governing was not intentional, although it is not true, as one historian famously claimed, that the conquest of India happened by accident.[2] Still, historians agree that the Company blundered into the government of Bengal in 1757 without quite realizing what it had done. For the most part, the Directors tried to avoid war: it was bad for business. The Company constrained British settlement and generally avoided meddling in local religions, since that too would have been bad for business.

No one today would disagree that the British should have stuck to trading. Nation-building is an ugly business at the best of times, and if it is to be done, then it should not be done by a handful of foreigners from a small island halfway around the world. However, we can condemn imperialism and still ask whether a private corporation did a reasonable job of building and managing a nation-state.

In the early years, it was atrocious. The Company’s servants were merchants who found themselves endowed with the authority of government officials. They lacked relevant experience and, faced with a profound conflict between interest and duty, they abused public authority for private gain. For example, Bengali leaders presented Clive of India with a personal fortune when he installed and kept them in positions of power. The Directors in London found they could do little about it, in part because there was nothing in their regulations that addressed such a situation; and because he was half a world away by sea. It also did not help that he returned home a national hero.

Over the first two or three decades of Company rule, its servants in India continued to accept (or extort) presents from native rulers. In the Company’s name, they forced villagers to trade with them on favorable terms. They refused to pay customs duties to local rulers and they...
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Ask your service provider: Are you a member of ISOA?
extracted fees from the people for performing public duties.

The 19th century English historian Thomas Macaulay wrote:

“...[A]t first English power came among them unaccompanied by English morality... During that interval the business of a servant of the Company was simply to wring out of the natives a hundred or two hundred thousand pounds as speedily as possible, that he might return home before his constitution had suffered from the heat, to marry a peer’s daughter, to buy rotten boroughs in Cornwall, and to give balls in St James’s Square. [...] it was an interval which has left on the fame of the East India Company a stain, not wholly effaced by many years of just and humane government.” [3]

Fortunately, the years of just and humane government did come. They began as early as 1772, with the appointment of Warren Hastings as Governor-General, but took truly took off starting in 1786, when Earl Charles Cornwallis initiated root and branch reform. By his retirement in 1793, the Indian Civil Service had been born.

Sir John Shore — who was to follow Cornwallis as Governor-General — commented in 1789 that there was more honesty, principle and humanity in the government of India than in England, and no country in the world where public officials devoted more of their time to public business. There would be ongoing problems with corruption, but the great plunder was over.

The Indian historian B.B. Misra wrote in the 1950s “Among the contributions of British rule in India the creation of the Indian Civil Service is one of the most remarkable. It constituted in fact the spine of the Indian body politic, and to it the people generally looked for the protection of person and property, of life and liberty. Its form and character developed under the rule of the East India Company.” [4] For more than half a century, from the 1790s until the end of Company rule in 1858, India was governed by a succession of remarkable public servants, men such as John Munro, Charles Metcalfe and Henry Lawrence, whose names deserve to be more widely known.

Because of its mercantile origins as well as a separation of powers forced on it by circumstance, the East India Company was a government of record. The 18th century political philosopher and reformer Edmund Burke wrote that the Company’s records manifest “a discipline and order which no state should be ashamed to copy.” It was a pioneer in professional public administration, with a college that schooled its young officers in political economy as well as local languages prior to their sailing from England.

In the first few decades of the 19th century, India became the testing ground for a new management philosophy developed by Jeremy Bentham, which represented the hottest new thinking about public administration in the English-speaking world. Bentham’s leading disciples, the political philosopher James Mill and his son John, were senior officials in the Company’s head office in London.

In some ways, the Company made for a better government precisely because it was a private corporation. The people of India could sue their government in tort or breach of contract a century or more before the people of England; and this was because the government of India was a corporation that could not claim Crown immunity. As John Stuart Mill argued in 1858, the separation of policy and administration implicit in this system of franchised government resulted in a level of accountability and transparency that would not have been possible if India was administered directly by British government.

The Indian Civil Service introduced merit appointment decades before the British Civil Service for precisely this reason: British politicians were happy to impose standards of professionalism on the Company that they were not yet prepared to demand of government at home.

Such a system of government is, of course, unthinkable in the modern world. Yet the East India Company provides us with a fascinating insight into the evolution of a trading corporation into a professional public administrator that was able to overcome many of the conflicts between public duty and private interest.

Endnotes

PRDC Pakistan Reconstruction & Development Conference

Entico Corporation are pleased to announce the inaugural Pakistan Reconstruction and Development Conference (PRDC), held on 24th - 25th May 2011 in Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

PRDC will bring private international companies together to meet with Pakistan government officials, police and military, NGOs, international agencies and just as importantly the major contractors, consultants and procurement officers that are helping with the reconstruction development and security of Pakistan.

In addition to the conference, all attendees will hold pre-scheduled one to one meetings with leading stakeholders relevant to their core business activities creating real business opportunities.

Who should attend:
- Building and Reconstruction
- Disaster Prevention and Emergency Relief
- Food, Water, Irrigation and Agriculture
- Information Technology and Telecommunications
- Logistics, Supply Chain and Transportation
- Security and Risk Management
- Education and Training
- Medical, Healthcare and Sanitation
- Power and Energy
- Consultancy Services

Limited sponsorship, branding opportunities will be available to the most suitable global operators.
For further information please contact Andy Dowell on +44 (0) 20 7799 2222 or email ad@entico.com. Website: http://www.entico.com/prdc/

Homeland Security Summit India

30 - 31 May 2011 - Delhi, India

Providing executive contributions and essential insight:
- Raghv Raman, CEO National Intelligence Grid, Ministry of Home Affairs
- Vinay Kalia, Assistant Inspector General, Central Industrial security forces, Government of India
- Maroof Raza, Defence Analyst and Mentor, Security Watch India
- Bhuvnesh Kumar, Project Director Low Intensity Conflicts, Defence Research Development Organization, Government of India
- Gayn Thomas, Science and Technology advisor, US Coast Guard

And many more

www.homelandsecurity-india.com/ipoa

For more information on sponsorship packages or to register for the early bird discount, please contact IQPC.
Call: +971 4 363 1938  Email: enquiry@iqpc.ac  Website: www.homelandsecurity-india.com/soa
NEW TECHNOLOGIES:
How these impact humanitarian and development operations

At the 8th Dubai International Humanitarian Aid & Development Conference & Exhibition

Participate & contribute at this important event by contacting us now
WWW.DIHAD.ORG

28 - 30 March, 2011
Dubai International Convention & Exhibition Centre
Online, on-demand training for your demanding career. Study specialized courses on peace support, security, and humanitarian relief operations.

- Introduction to the UN System
- Civil-Military Coordination (CIMIC)
- Conduct of Humanitarian Operations
- Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR)
- Ethics in Peacekeeping
- Gender Perspectives in UN Peacekeeping
- History of UN Peacekeeping
- Logistical Support to UN Peacekeeping Ops
- Operational Logistical Support
- Advanced Topics in Logistics (COE)
- Mine Action
- Peacekeeping and International Conflict Resolution
- Preventing Violence Against Women
- United Nations Military Observers
- United Nations Police

Readers of this journal are eligible for free enrolment into the following course: Principles and Guidelines for UN Peacekeeping Operations.

View the complete curriculum with translations at www.peaceopstraining.org.
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**Afghanistan Reconstruction Summit**

**AI Hamra Hotels & Resort**

**Ras Al Khaimah, UAE**

**5-6 May 2011**

---

**THE SUMMARY**

Global Investment Summits are pleased to announce the second ARIS, to be held in November. Afghanistan continues to hold the world's gaze, with the international community having a vested interest in its future. The need to build an infrastructure capable of supporting a stable economy is paramount to the reconstruction efforts.

The geographic location of Afghanistan provides an ideal platform on which to build. With a wealth of natural resources combined with an urgent need for security, education and construction, a picture emerges of an economy with vast growth potential given the right amount of support.

**THE OBJECTIVES**

On-going reconstruction and development efforts are vital to the stabilisation of the region. The Afghanistan Reconstruction Summit will provide an opportunity for achieving these objectives, outlining key business opportunities in various sectors and enabling companies to play a leading role in the development of a country rich in potential.

Our unique summit format combines plenary addresses on key areas with the opportunity for private discussions between attending companies and the various international delegations in attendance.

**THE BENEFITS**

The Afghanistan Reconstruction Summit will serve the needs of businesses already operating in the area or looking to get involved in the reconstruction and development process of Afghanistan.

With key decision makers in attendance, this summit will provide a platform on which the future economic success of the region will be built. Leading companies can schedule meetings with procurement officers, relevant ministries, departments and organisations in order to open dialogue and secure contracts in their area of expertise.

For more info contact:

**+44 (0) 844 257 9452**

p.bosher@investmentsummits.com

www.investmentsummits.com
COUNTER-NARCOTICS & BORDER CONTROL SUMMIT

La Palm Royal Beach Hotel
Accra, Ghana
July 13-14 2011

THE SUMMIT

Global Investment Summits are pleased to confirm the hosting of our inaugural Counter-Narcotics & Border Control Summit to take place in Accra, Ghana.

This historic event will bring together regional governments, key agencies and industry leaders to develop strategies and implement technologies to counter the growing threat of the narcotics trade through the West African region.

Drug trafficking threatens global security with a regional impact that creates complex interdependencies and security challenges that requires international and regional cooperation.

THE OBJECTIVES

With a local, national and global focus on the problems caused by drug smuggling, there is a strong will from the highest level to stem, and eventually end, this trade.

During the course of this two day event, Government Ministers and senior Military figures from across Africa, NATO representatives and high ranking members from the American Military will outline their needs and hold meetings with reputable private companies that can provide solutions to the tough challenges presented by the key issues of counter-narcotics and border control.

THE BENEFITS

After the morning plenary addresses, the summit will be transformed in to a series of pre-scheduled roundtables meetings, arranged in advance via our meeting scheduling website and available to all attendees.

Attending organisations will be presented with the opportunity to hold private discussion with the various international delegations in attendance.

The opportunity presented by bringing together the leading stakeholders and international counter-narcotics experts together under one-roof over a two day period is unrivalled and not to be missed.

For more info contact:
+44 (0) 845 003 8207

events@investmentsummits.com
www.investmentsummits.com

ADVANCED DEFENCE & SECURITY TECHNOLOGY SUMMIT

THE SUMMIT

Global Investment Summits are pleased to announce the forthcoming Advanced Defence and Security Summit (ADST), held with the support of the ISOA.

The defence and security sector in the middle east has seen substantial investment in the last decade with on-going, vigorous commitments from within the region and all over the world.

Cutting edge technologies are at the forefront, whether for border protection, biometric systems, counter terrorism, infrastructure security or promoting and establishing regional communications and cooperation.

THE OBJECTIVES

ADST will bring together forward thinking, sector leading operators to meet with ministers and security officials.

The focus of this summit is procurement and partnerships, and participants such as GCC Defence Ministries and Armed Forces, U.S. Regional Commands and leading NATO Members will be seeking to partner with innovative, reputable and leading private sector companies utilising our unique summit format, designed to provide the platform for business leaders to showcase and discuss the best defence, security and communications solutions for the future.

THE BENEFITS

Leading companies who wish to add their expertise and form partnerships with attending Ministries, Militaries and Commands would gain an unrivalled opportunity to present their ideas and hold private discussions on how best to find solutions to the challenges presented.

High ranking representatives from the private sector with an interest in doing business in the Gulf Region would find this summit crucial in fostering relationships with Ministers, Directors General, Chiefs of Staff and procurement officers.

By bringing these key decision makers together under one roof for the duration of this two day event, the opportunities presented by ADST are unrivalled.

For more info contact:
+44 (0) 844 257 9456

events@investmentsummits.com
www.investmentsummits.com
ISOA annual summit
the premier event of the stability operations industry
24 - 26 October 2011
Ronald Reagan
International Trade Center
Washington, D.C.

highlights
networking
industry leaders
ISOA year in review
summit dinner
industry exhibition

the summit
the 2½ day annual summit in Washington, D.C. will include prominent guest speakers, panel discussions on all aspects of the stability operations industry, networking opportunities, and an exhibition.

visit www.stability-operations.org/summit2011 for more information

AID & INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FORUM
June 8-9 2011 | Washington D.C. USA
Building partnerships for relief and development

The Aid & International Development Forum (AIDF) provides a leading global platform for those involved in the effective delivery of humanitarian aid, relief and development.

The Aid & International Development Forum is a FREE to attend event.
Register online today at: www.aidforumonline.org/register
The ISOA Membership

The International Stability Operations Association is proud to have a multisectoral membership that represents the many various aspects of operations performed in conflict, post-conflict, disaster relief and reconstruction efforts. The Membership Directory attempts to provide a visualization of the different roles that our member companies fulfill in contingency operations by using the icons below to classify each company’s activities.

Abbreviations
HQ Location of company headquarters
W Website
PC ISOA Point-of-Contact/Designated Delegate
YM Number of years as Member of ISOA

AECOM Technology Corporation
HQ Los Angeles, California
W www.aecom.com
PC Col. Rick Orth (Ret.)
YM 3.0 years

Air Charter Service PLC
HQ Surrey, United Kingdom
W www.aircharter.co.uk
PC Tony Bauckham
YM 1.0 years

AMECO
HQ Greenville, South Carolina
W www.ameco.com
PC Paul Camp
YM 5.7 years

American Glass Products
HQ Ras Al Khaimah, U.A.E.
W www.agpglass.com
PC Tobias Beutgen
YM 2.9 years

Agility
HQ Safat, Kuwait
W www.agilitylogistics.com
PC Thomas Shortley
YM 5.2 years

ARINC Engineering Services LLC
HQ Annapolis, Maryland
W www.arinc.com
PC Bradley J. Little
YM 0.7 years

BAE Systems
HQ Rockville, Maryland
W www.baesystems.com
PC Mary Robinson
YM 0.3 years

Baker Tilly
HQ Vienna, Virginia
W www.bakertilly.com
PC Bill Keating
YM 1.0 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>HQ</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>YM</th>
<th>YM Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMMI</td>
<td>Sirta, Bahrain</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bmmigroup.com">www.bmmigroup.com</a></td>
<td>Carla Geday</td>
<td>New Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Rands Associates</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.burtonrands.com">www.burtonrands.com</a></td>
<td>Nicola Loverth</td>
<td>2.2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowell &amp; Moring LLP</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.crowell.com">www.crowell.com</a></td>
<td>David Hammond</td>
<td>2.8 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS International</td>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cssil.com">www.cssil.com</a></td>
<td>Timothy Doyle</td>
<td>New Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA Piper LLP</td>
<td>London, United Kingdom</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dlapiper.com">www.dlapiper.com</a></td>
<td>Tara Lee</td>
<td>2.2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DynCorp International</td>
<td>Falls Church, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dyn-intl.com">www.dyn-intl.com</a></td>
<td>John Gastright</td>
<td>4.0 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecolog International</td>
<td>Dubai, U.A.E.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecolog-international.com">www.ecolog-international.com</a></td>
<td>Florin Hasani</td>
<td>3.0 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD Technology, Inc.</td>
<td>Lenoir City, Tennessee</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eodt.com">www.eodt.com</a></td>
<td>Bill Pearse</td>
<td>5.2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Crystal &amp; Company</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.frackrystal.com">www.frackrystal.com</a></td>
<td>Jeffrey Wingate</td>
<td>0.6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSI Worldwide</td>
<td>Dubai, U.A.E.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fsi-worldwide.com">www.fsi-worldwide.com</a></td>
<td>Nicholas Forster</td>
<td>2.6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GardaWorld</td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gardaworld.com">www.gardaworld.com</a></td>
<td>Andrew Gibson</td>
<td>2.5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Dunn &amp; Crutcher LLP</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gibsondunn.com">www.gibsondunn.com</a></td>
<td>Joseph D. West</td>
<td>0.8 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>Limassol, Cyprus</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hartsecurity.com">www.hartsecurity.com</a></td>
<td>Claire Kee</td>
<td>6.3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland &amp; Hart LLP</td>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hollandhart.com">www.hollandhart.com</a></td>
<td>Trip Mackintosh</td>
<td>1.8 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconex, Inc.</td>
<td>Sterling, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.interconex.com">www.interconex.com</a></td>
<td>Kieran Kayatin</td>
<td>0.4 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Armored Group</td>
<td>Ras Al Khaimah, U.A.E.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.interarmored.com">www.interarmored.com</a></td>
<td>Sally Stefova</td>
<td>3.7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relief &amp; Development</td>
<td>Arlington, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ird.org">www.ird.org</a></td>
<td>Jeffrey Grieco</td>
<td>0.3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-3 Global Services</td>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td><a href="http://www.j-3globalservices.com">www.j-3globalservices.com</a></td>
<td>Joe Woolslayer</td>
<td>4.7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MineWolf Systems</td>
<td>Pfaffikon, Switzerland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.minewolf.com">www.minewolf.com</a></td>
<td>Philipp von Michaelis</td>
<td>2.6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Essential Personnel</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td><a href="http://www.missionepc.com">www.missionepc.com</a></td>
<td>Chris Taylor</td>
<td>2.6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPRI, an L-3 Division</td>
<td>Alexandria, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mpri.com">www.mpri.com</a></td>
<td>Hank Allen</td>
<td>8.2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>YM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Century</td>
<td>Arlington, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.newcentcorp.com">www.newcentcorp.com</a></td>
<td>Laura Englebreeht</td>
<td>2.6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Group</td>
<td>Dubai, U.A.E.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.olivegroup.com">www.olivegroup.com</a></td>
<td>Gene Stieco</td>
<td>5.2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPREAO Logistics</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td><a href="http://www.osprea.com">www.osprea.com</a></td>
<td>Salih Brandt</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSI, Inc.</td>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ossiinc.com">www.ossiinc.com</a></td>
<td>John Wallbridge</td>
<td>5.3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Lease Group</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale, Florida</td>
<td><a href="http://www.overseasleasegroup.com">www.overseasleasegroup.com</a></td>
<td>Tracy Badcock</td>
<td>3.0 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAE</td>
<td>Arlington, VA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.paeigroup.com">www.paeigroup.com</a></td>
<td>Tom Callahan</td>
<td>4.7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount Logistics</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td><a href="http://www.paramountgroup.biz">www.paramountgroup.biz</a></td>
<td>Richard Merrison</td>
<td>1.9 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pax Mondial</td>
<td>Arlington, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.paxmondial.com">www.paxmondial.com</a></td>
<td>Paul Wood</td>
<td>2.2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Inc.</td>
<td>Leesburg, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.reedinc.com">www.reedinc.com</a></td>
<td>Marius van der Riet</td>
<td>5.0 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relyant</td>
<td>Maryville, Tennessee</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gorelyant.com">www.gorelyant.com</a></td>
<td>Tiffany Midyett</td>
<td>1.6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford</td>
<td>Alexandria, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rutherford.com">www.rutherford.com</a></td>
<td>Sara Payne</td>
<td>3.0 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safenet</td>
<td>Dubai, U.A.E.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.safenet.net">www.safenet.net</a></td>
<td>Mauritz le Roux</td>
<td>New Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securiforce International America</td>
<td>Fort Worth, Texas</td>
<td><a href="http://www.securiforce-ia.com">www.securiforce-ia.com</a></td>
<td>Kenneth Nix</td>
<td>2.2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securiguard Inc.</td>
<td>McLean, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.securiguardinc.com">www.securiguardinc.com</a></td>
<td>Peter McVety</td>
<td>2.6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield International Security</td>
<td>Seoul, South Korea</td>
<td><a href="http://www.shieldconsulting.co.kr">www.shieldconsulting.co.kr</a></td>
<td>Lucy Park</td>
<td>1.0 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shook, Hardy &amp; Bacon LLP</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.shb.com">www.shb.com</a></td>
<td>David Douglass</td>
<td>2.0 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC Inc.</td>
<td>Chantilly, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.soc-usa.com">www.soc-usa.com</a></td>
<td>Shawn James</td>
<td>3.5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS International Ltd.</td>
<td>Reston, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sosiltd.com">www.sosiltd.com</a></td>
<td>Michael K. Seidl</td>
<td>3.7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telum Protection Corp</td>
<td>Southern Pines, N. Carolina</td>
<td><a href="http://www.telumcorp.com">www.telumcorp.com</a></td>
<td>Alfredo Quiros</td>
<td>0.5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple Canopy</td>
<td>Herndon, Virginia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.triplecanopy.com">www.triplecanopy.com</a></td>
<td>Mark DeWitt</td>
<td>4.3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity Resources Group</td>
<td>Dubai, U.A.E.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unityresourcesgroup.com">www.unityresourcesgroup.com</a></td>
<td>Jim LeBlanc</td>
<td>4.2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
military actors on the ground in such circumstances, and to work out what those relationships will be in advance. There are some lessons, which were again visible during the Asian tsunami, which were not fully learned. What you had in Haiti again was hundreds of NGOs turning up, some of them not particularly well qualified, and more likely to be part of the problem than the solution. I am not talking about the big, international organizations, but of many smaller ones with no track record or capacity.

I also think there are questions about ensuring better stockpiles of essential goods that can be accessible more quickly, for example, ready-to-eat meals and tents and tarps. Another issue is the relative unfamiliarity of the international community with disasters in urban settings, like Port-au-Prince. Overall there are a lot of lessons which the international community is attempting to learn to make sure that we are better prepared and more effective next time around.

JIPO: A year after the devastating earthquake struck Haiti, is it fair to say that the reconstruction and recovery efforts have not been promising? What accounts for the slow progress? Is this typical or perhaps indicative of overly ambitious thinking for a twelve-month period?

Holmes: I think it is a bit of both those things. Clearly it is very disappointing that a year after the earthquake there are so many people still in makeshift camps, in which conditions are often very poor, that the rubble clearance is so slow; and that reconstruction is also slow. There are complex reasons behind this. We do not have a very effective government to deal with, but at the same time we need the local government to be in the lead. There are some basic, unresolved questions about land rights which have had a particularly slowing effect on reconstruction.

I think expectations are also probably always exaggerated. The amount of rubble in Port-au-Prince was mind bogglingly large and very difficult to deal with. The money has been slow to flow for reconstruction from the outside. We have a bit of a chicken and egg situation here, where donor governments are not willing to put money in until the exact ways of spending it are clear, while projects are slow to develop because those responsible do not know if the money is going to be there.

These are issues which are not unique to Haiti, but are particularly difficult in the complicated context of Haiti. We all knew it was going to take ten years at least to get Haiti better than it was before, so we are going to have to be patient in doing that. Unfortunately, those in the camps are going to have to be particularly patient.

Holmes: I think that there are two points here. One is that we do want to involve the private sector more in the humanitarian response and reconstruction efforts because we recognize that they have a lot to bring to the party, not only in terms of resources, but also expertise, skills, speed, and so on. So we need to find ways to engage them more and find ways of having partnerships that are effective well in advance of disasters.

At the same time, I think there is a degree of nervousness about involving private sector organizations in humanitarian response because humanitarian response has to be based on fundamental principles like impartiality, independence and neutrality. And however good an organization is, if it is doing it for a profit motive, it is not necessarily going to be most concerned with these principles. And particularly private sector organizations that have been contracted by a belligerent party, for example some of the American contractors in Iraq, raise some fundamental questions about the nature of the humanitarian work they are doing. We need to make sure that the private sector is not taking over inappropriate work, while at the same time involving them more and using their skills in ways that are genuinely constructive.

Also, we need to recognize that humanitarian work has become much more dangerous than ever. Now we have situations in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Somalia, where humanitarians are being targeted, and end up being assassinated, kidnapped or assaulted in other ways. People are ready to put themselves in harm’s way, but the risks are increasing and we need to find better ways of tackling this.

JIPO: As a result of the tepid international response to some of the larger humanitarian crises such as the Rwanda genocide, former U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan and others have contemplated a larger role for the private sector “in providing the United Nations with the rapid reaction capacity it needs.” What is the potential that an enhanced role for the private sector could add to the U.N.’s response capacity?

Holmes: There are no doubt some possibilities there. However I do not think the private sector can substitute in key areas for states or the international community; it has to be subordinate to them. I think there is a related issue, which is that there is always a wish to have more standing capacity available to the U.N. to intervene in situations. We want to make sure the alarm bells are being rung much earlier. There remains the question, though, if you do ring the alarm bells and decide to intervene, who is actually going to do it? It has to be the armies of some states that are ready to put their own soldiers at risk. Particularly in the contexts of what happened in Iraq and what is happening in Afghanistan, and the discredit those situations have brought on the idea of outside military intervention, it may be very difficult to find those forces. People have suggested some kind of standing forces at the disposal of the U.N. for intervention when decided by the international community. But the reality is that the high financial and political cost means that this is probably not going to occur in the foreseeable future.
Since 1998, International Relief & Development has been helping provide the world’s most vulnerable people with the tools and resources needed to increase their self-sufficiency.

In South Sudan, IRD partnered with USAID and the National Democratic Institute to distribute thousands of wind-up and solar-powered radios to populations living near conflict areas, including returning refugees, internally displaced persons, traditional leaders, demobilized soldiers, women, and teachers. The radios allow communities to learn about the latest developments in the peace process and how their government works.

One program, Let’s Talk, educates listeners on topics ranging from Sudan’s transitional legal framework to strategies to combat corruption. IRD organized listening groups of 10–15 people who meet regularly, listen to the program, and discuss the issues it raises. Demand for the bright blue radios is high, and people are excited to receive them. “These are very important things you have given us,” one woman told IRD: “Important for peace.”

In Sudan as elsewhere, we place a premium on strengthening the capabilities of beneficiaries to build peaceful and sustainable change on their own. Working from the bottom up, IRD aims to give host-country citizens a voice in their future and include them in the stabilization and long-term development of their communities and nations.
There is something new about IPOA. But there is nothing new about our members’ commitment to supporting stability operations, reconstruction and development.

The International Stability Operations Association serves as a valued and trusted association representing ethical and professional organizations partnering in stability, support and development efforts worldwide.

Ask your service provider: Are you a member of ISOA?