



International Association for Volunteer Effort

# “Leading Together in the Face of Disaster”

The Global Dialogue on  
Corporate-NGO Volunteer Partnerships

*“...companies throughout the world respond to...disasters and humanitarian crises with money... goods [and] services, expertise and leadership...through their partnerships, both formal and informal, with humanitarian agencies and NGOs that bring expertise... increasing the scope and value of their work.”*



## A Note on Terms

Throughout this report:

“NGO” should be understood to include non-governmental organizations, humanitarian agencies, the International Federation of Red Cross Red Crescent and agencies of the United Nations;

“Disasters” and “disaster-related activities” should be understood to include preparedness, prevention, response, relief and short- and long-term recovery.

## In Appreciation

The Global Dialogue was made possible through the sponsorship of UPS® which also was Diamond Sponsor of IAVE’s 22nd World Volunteer Conference at which the Dialogue was held.

We deeply appreciate the active leadership and support of Eduardo Martinez, President of The UPS Foundation, and the assistance of Joe Ruiz, Director of the UPS Humanitarian Relief Program, and of Jane Smallman of KPMG International.



## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| About the Global Dialogue                   | 2  |
| About IAVE                                  | 2  |
| Introduction                                | 2  |
| The Dynamics of Partnerships                | 3  |
| The Role of Volunteers                      | 7  |
| The Role of Technology                      | 9  |
| Participants in the London Dialogue Session | 10 |
| The Interviews                              | 11 |



## About the Global Dialogue

The Global Dialogue on Corporate-NGO Volunteer Partnerships Related to Disasters had two primary focal points:

- The Dynamics of Partnerships. How do they work? What makes them successful? What are the risks? What are the realities, the limitations? What are the potential benefits to both parties and how can those be realized?
- The Role of Volunteers. What are appropriate and inappropriate roles for volunteers? How can engagement of people with needed expertise be maximized? What are the opportunities for people at distance from a disaster to help? How can companies create an employee engagement program around disaster?

The Dialogue consisted of two components:

- Preparatory interviews with 20 corporations and NGOs (which here includes humanitarian organizations, IFRC and United Nations) to gain perspective on the issues and challenges confronting partnerships focused on disasters and on the engagement of volunteers in activities related to disasters; and,
- A one-day Dialogue session held on December 10, 2012 in London, in conjunction with IAVE's World Volunteer Conference, involving 25 participants from corporations and humanitarian agencies. Additional related content sessions were integrated into the conference program.



The interviews and discussion ranged across the continuum of disaster-related activities, from preparedness and prevention to response and relief to short and long term recovery.

The goal of this process was to go beyond the immediate value of the discussion for those who participated to the formulation of ideas that could be shared more broadly with the global business and humanitarian communities to stimulate their thinking and their action.

This report summarizes learnings from both the preparatory interviews and the Dialogue session.

## About IAVE

The Dialogue was convened by IAVE – The International Association for Volunteer Effort as part of its ongoing commitment to be a global knowledge leader for corporate volunteering, a role that began with its landmark global research project

on corporate volunteering, Global Companies Volunteering Globally, completed in 2011. IAVE also convenes the Global Corporate Volunteer Council, some 40 global companies that come together to share their experiences, innovations and challenges, learn from one another and work together to promote and support corporate volunteering at the global level.

IAVE is the only global network of individual leaders, NGOs and businesses that exists for the sole purpose of promoting, strengthening and celebrating the myriad of ways volunteering happens throughout the world. It has members in 70+ countries, convenes the biennial World Volunteer Conference and regional conferences and is developing a global network of National Volunteer Centers and building an online platform to connect youth volunteers worldwide. For more information about IAVE, please visit

[www.iave.org](http://www.iave.org).



## Introduction

At dawn on Wednesday, April 19, 1906, E.H. Harriman, owner of the Southern Pacific Railroad, left New York City on his private train, instructing his engineer to make record speed for San Francisco. It was just 24 hours after that city and the surrounding region had been devastated by earthquake and fire. Harriman, who with his wife had a record of civic engagement, environmental protection and philanthropy, telegraphed ahead to make sure his train was loaded with provisions for the relief of the homeless. He made his trains and shipping lines available free of charge, ultimately transporting more than 270,000 people fleeing the city. Company hospitals were opened at no cost and company doctors and nurses worked around the clock for six days.



*“For global companies, the sobering reality is that virtually every disaster will be ‘close to home’ for some of their employees...”*

Historian Dennis Smith wrote this about Harriman’s engagement with the disaster:

*Harriman was the first major personage to reach the city to offer assistance, and he was to stay the longest, not leaving until May 5. He worked tirelessly with the city’s leadership, offering his advice, money and relationships to relieve the suffering of San Franciscans, living all the while in the moving mansion that was his railroad car. Like most important donors in American history, Harriman had a firm belief in his own capabilities, and it was said that his self-confidence supported and inspired those around him...Harriman’s generosity set a precedent for a new American corporate responsibility in the face of catastrophe, a philanthropic rule of thumb that says: Those that can, should.”<sup>1</sup>*



Over 100 years later, that legacy has taken root in the global business community. Today, companies throughout the world respond to global and local disasters and humanitarian crises with money, donated goods, donated services, expertise and leadership.

Importantly, the impact of their commitment has been magnified through their partnerships, both formal and informal, with humanitarian agencies and NGOs that bring expertise in disaster preparedness and prevention, response, relief and recovery. When successfully conceived, implemented and managed, these partnerships enhance and expand the numbers of communities and people those agencies can serve, increasing the scope and value of their work.

Increasingly, attention is turning to how to most effectively engage the greatest asset companies have, their people. With the growth of corporate volunteering and the concomitant increase in media attention and thus public awareness of disasters, both

employees and companies are seeking the best way for both to help.

We live in a time in which natural disasters and extreme weather events are happening with greater frequency, exacerbated by climate change. While they impact many, they disproportionately change the lives of those people and communities that are more vulnerable and less resilient. For global companies, the sobering reality is that virtually every disaster will be “close to home” for some of their employees and for the communities in which they do business.



It is against that backdrop that IAVE – The International Association for Volunteer Effort convened the “Global Dialogue on Corporate-NGO Volunteer Partnerships Related to Disaster.” The Dialogue is part of the ongoing commitment of IAVE to be a global knowledge leader in corporate volunteering.

## The Dynamics of Partnerships

### BACKGROUND

In 2011, IAVE published “Global Companies Volunteering Globally,” the final report of its global research on corporate volunteering in which we interviewed 48 global companies about their volunteer efforts. One of the key conclusions was that “global and local partnerships with NGOs are an essential element of corporate volunteering.”

We noted that while in times past many companies viewed NGOs as “useful but not necessary,” that is changing with “recognition that NGOs have expertise that can guide corporate involvement and proven, in-place metrics that can demonstrate impact and effectiveness.”

We concluded that “the value of NGOs as partners in corporate volunteering has grown steadily, opening new possibilities for companies to increase impact internally and externally and for NGOs to gain access to new resources that can help achieve their missions.”

But, we went on to caution, “NGOs must understand and be comfortable responding to what companies



are seeking in their partnerships, particularly in terms of supporting employee professional and personal development.”

Finally, we summarized

what we had learned from companies and their partners in this statement: *“Mutual commitment to open communication, joint planning and mutual assessment, learning and feedback strengthen corporate-NGO partnerships.”*<sup>2</sup>

We also cited the work of Professor James E. Austin of Harvard Business School who a decade ago posited three stages of partnerships between companies and NGOs:

- Philanthropic – *“check writing...charity mindset”*
- Transactional – *“significant two-way value exchange”*
- Integrative or Transformational – *“strategic alliances...deep mission mesh”*<sup>3</sup>

In our study, the vast majority of the partnerships we heard about could be classified as “transactional,” certainly in intent if not always in results. A few were suggestive of the Integrative/Transformational stage Austin described. Those went far beyond employee volunteering to engage the full range of corporate resources.

Today, in the relationships between companies and NGOs related to disasters, we can see examples of each of these stages of partnership development.

Many, perhaps most, clearly remain primarily philanthropic as humanitarian agencies define their primary needs as being for money or for specific in-kind contributions of goods and services. But, there are exceptions. Certainly much of the discussion in our interviews was around transactional partnerships. In a very few examples did we hear the beginnings of what might grow into integrative/transformational partnerships.

## THE INTERVIEWS AND THE ISSUES

Many of the issues that emerged from our interviews align closely with the kinds of issues about partnerships that we heard in our broader research and can apply to any partnership, although the answers clearly may be different in disaster-related partnerships.

- What are the potential benefits of partnerships for companies? For NGOs?
- What are the critical success factors for a corporate-NGO partnership?
- What are the risk factors of partnership?
- How do NGOs need to change to be effective partners?
- How do companies need to change to be effective partners?
- How do partnerships created at the global level become “real” throughout both corporate and NGO systems? Does the “partnership dialogue” need to be repeated over and over at all levels?

Other issues clearly are specific to the dynamics and management of disaster-related partnerships.

- How can companies understand the humanitarian system and its principles and be prepared to work within it?
- What are the best ways for companies to prepare internally in advance so that they can be most effective in their responses when called on to help?
- How can we manage either perceptions or realities of commercial/market motivations or opportunities? (“Companies often do not grasp our sensitivities. We often don’t grasp that their motivations are not commercial.”)
- From the NGO side: What is the reality of having as partners companies that are competitive with one another? Will they work together? Will we be pulled in different directions? Will we have to choose?
- From the corporate side: What is the reality of



having as partners NGOs that are competitive with one another? Will they work together? Will we be pulled in different directions? Will we have to choose?

- How do we reconcile the branding needs of both partners?
- What and how can we learn from each other and from volunteers who are involved in ways that help us improve our performance, not only when we are working together but all the time?

A third group of issues relate directly to the work being done in disaster-related partnerships.

- How best can companies contribute to risk reduction, prevention and preparedness?
- What is the on-the-ground role, if any, of companies in response and relief?
- What happens when the cameras leave, when the “CNN moment” is over? Can we move companies into commitment to sustained recovery and development work?
- What happens to crises that do not make it into the media? How do we capture corporate attention for them?

These issues were shared with participants in the Dialogue as the starting point for their discussion about the dynamics of partnerships.

## THE DIALOGUE DISCUSSION

**Trust.** The dominant theme of the initial discussion on partnerships was about the lack of trust between companies and NGOs.



From the NGO perspective, there was the open question of why companies want to be involved. As one asked, “Is it branding, marketing or philanthropy?”

There was recognition that attitudes are deeply rooted on both sides. A company said, “We would like to see NGOs be less defensive and

*not pretend you are perfect. You need to be honest about your reality. With greater understanding, we can be more responsive.”*

As the discussion evolved, there was general agreement that humanitarian organizations and companies represent different business models that are driven by different value systems with different ways of operating. This is neither “good” nor “bad,” simply the reality.



For the humanitarian organizations, it is important that companies recognize that their work is an established professional field, one shaped by humanitarian principles and a code of conduct. Their work requires specialized knowledge, skills and relationships. As one participant put it, “It is not just something you can jump into and do without advance preparation.”

There is a sense that companies have the belief that they can do the work better, simply because they are businesses and not NGOs, even when they have invested little in understanding both the realities of the work and the settings in which it must be done.

*“...Humanitarian organizations and companies represent different business models... driven by different value systems with different ways of operating.”*

As a result, in this view, most companies do not understand and accept that they can learn at least as much if

not more from humanitarian organizations as those organizations can learn from them. One NGO participant underscored this: “They have the view that we can learn from only one direction. But there needs to be more two-way learning. We can learn from them about how to do some aspects of our work better. They can learn from us the realities of humanitarian work.”

### **Time, Commitment, Resources and Communication.**

An NGO participant said, “It sounds simple to create a partnership when we have needs that companies are willing to meet, but it isn’t.” It is the very differences in their business models that often keep companies and NGOs from forming strong, effective partnerships.

There was broad agreement that it takes time to build a solid partnership with some participants believing as much as three to five years. As important, it takes





a solid commitment, shared leadership and sustained communication.

The word most often used to describe the partnership development process was “dialogue.” Each party needs to understand the other’s realities.

Each needs to understand their own needs and the assets they are bringing to their work together. There must be a shared commitment to transparency and to problem-solving. It is through sustained dialogue these can be achieved.

Most important, participants continued to underscore that partnerships must be built in advance of disasters. As one person said, *“We can’t follow up on opportunities offered to us when an emergency is in progress.”*

At the same time, corporate participants pointed out that they often are under the greatest pressure to get involved at the time that disasters happen. In some ways it is the result of what was referred to as the “CNN moment” when the disaster is at the center of media attention.

That pressure may come from a variety of the company’s stakeholders, including its employees who want to do something to help.

Both companies and NGOs are challenged, participants agreed, to make the investment in partnership development when the need is not immediate and urgent.

**Keys to Effective Partnerships.** These were mentioned as essential elements of effective partnerships:

- mutual benefit that is clearly articulated and understood by all;
- transparency throughout the partnership;
- a defined relationship of a defined duration with an understood exit strategy;
- clear expectations that are articulated, agreed and documented;
- ongoing dialogue at all levels, from the level where the partnership is negotiated and agreed to the level where it is operational;
- acceptance that partnership development is

not a simple process and that to do it right takes mutual commitment, investment and leadership.

**Global companies are local companies.** At one point in the discussion, a company representative made the point that the company does not encourage or enable employees to travel to disasters to serve as volunteers. While there was general agreement about the need to discourage “disaster tourism,” it brought the group to a different point, the one raised during the preparatory interviews – that global companies are local companies.

That is, because of the scope and reach of global companies, the scope and reach of humanitarian agencies and the reality of occurrence

of natural and man-made disasters throughout the world, a “global company” likely will find itself and its employees directly affected by and engaged with a “local disaster.”

At that point it may become moot whether a company asks employees not to get engaged. They and their families and communities may already be engaged because of proximity.

Several participants underscored the value that local staff can bring, whether on loan from the company or as volunteers: language skills, local relationships, knowledge of local realities, networks, and the ability to bring people together.

But there also was agreement that global partnerships do not always “cascade down,” as one participant put it. Global partnerships need to be acted out at various levels – and that takes special attention to decision-making chains.

An NGO said, *“We would love to be able to go directly to your companies at the local level. But when deals are done at the regional or global levels, it is hard to bring down to the local. Or, when deals are started locally, it is hard to push them up highly enough quickly enough for a decision.”*

*“It sounds simple to create a partnership when we have needs that companies are willing to meet, but it isn’t.”*







That led to recognition that the relationship-building that takes place at the global level – as partners get to know one another, build trust, develop shared expectations and create their own operational rules and processes – does not necessarily translate down through their respective systems. It may be necessary to consciously do the same kind of relationship building

throughout those systems, to “cascade down” the dialogue to ensure the operational viability of partnerships.

## The Role of Volunteers

### BACKGROUND

The core conclusion of IAVE’s Global Corporate Volunteering Research Project was that “corporate volunteering is a dynamic global force, driven by companies that want to make a significant difference to serious global and local problems.”<sup>4</sup>

We came to understand that corporate volunteering is a “big tent” that encompasses a broad range of activities, philosophies, approaches and management structures.

There is no “best way” to do corporate volunteering. Decisions about the nature and scope of a company’s volunteer efforts are highly situational, based on its culture, priorities, resources, the nature of its business and workforce and the on-the-ground realities of the communities in which it does business. We concluded, *“While it is better to do something than to do nothing, it is not necessarily better to try to do everything.”*<sup>5</sup>



Overall, it was clear that volunteering is being put to work by companies, in varying degrees, as a strategic asset to help achieve business goals. Employee engagement and development is the area in which this is most true – building commitment and morale, learning social realities, developing leadership, strengthening teams, enhancing business and personal

knowledge and skills, and recruiting and integrating new employees.

Perhaps the most significant trend is skills-based volunteering, the conscious use of professional and personal skills to benefit the community. It is seen as:

- a way for companies to increase their impact on specific problems;
- a capacity-building resource for NGOs and communities;
- a way to better engage employees and leverage their skills;
- an opportunity for employees to practice their existing skills and learn new ones.

There are great examples of how companies are successfully implementing skills-based volunteering and of the impact focused, highly skilled volunteers are having. Often at the heart of success are the partnerships created by companies and NGOs.



### THE INTERVIEWS AND THE ISSUES

Throughout our background interviews for the Dialogue, NGOs told us that their highest priority in regards to corporate volunteering is to engage people with specific expertise that is directly relevant to the organization’s work in the field – logistics, communications, technology, health care, water and sanitation and on into all of the dimensions of recovery. NGOs are seeking people who can serve as consultants to improve their internal systems as well as, in specific cases, people who can serve in the field alongside the NGOs.

These specific issues emerged from our interviews:

- Does it matter whether it is “the company volunteering” (an employee is designated to fulfill an assignment) or “the individual volunteering” (employee volunteers to participate in company activity or on her/his own)? Do NGOs care?
- What is the appropriate role of volunteers, if any, in response and relief activities? What are the realities of that?
- How can engagement of people with expertise





be maximized and coordinated – internally, among companies, among NGOs?

- How can we match the “window of need” with the “window of availability?” That is, how do we deal with the realities of the demands of corporate life and

work and the limited time people may have or the timing disconnect between need and availability?

- What can volunteers do without leaving home? Is there a “basket of options” that can be offered up for those who want to help? Can advocacy activities be an option – for example, encouraging government funding for relief and recovery in specific disasters?
- More and more global companies are becoming skilled at working virtually. How does this impact volunteering in relation to disasters?
- What can corporate volunteers appropriately do in the areas of risk reduction, prevention and preparedness?
- How can companies create multi-dimensional employee engagement programs related to disasters?

An interesting topic that came up repeatedly was how best to leverage the reality that the workforces of global companies are also global, that companies may well have workers in areas struck by disasters.



Most of the NGOs interviewed did not appear to have given specific thought to how to take best advantage of this global corporate presence.

Most companies interviewed did not appear to have adjusted the policies and processes guiding their engagement with disasters to take account of their potential on-the-ground presence in disaster zones. These issues arose:

- What will companies do to assist their employees who are victims of disasters? How does that align or compete with their broader response?
- When employees are already in or near disaster zones, are their special ways they can be of help

to NGOs – knowledge of local community and culture, being multi-lingual, understanding how to work with people from outside the community, etc?

- How can the desire to volunteer on the part of employees already in or near disaster zones be managed by the company?
- How, together, can companies and NGOs plan in advance for the engagement of employee volunteers already present in disaster zones?
- What does volunteering mean in context of people affected by disasters? How do you support them? How do you enable them to volunteer while still meeting their needs?

These issues were shared with participants in the Dialogue as the starting point for their discussion about the role of volunteers.

### THE DIALOGUE DISCUSSION

Paul Molinaro from UNICEF helped kick off the discussion by briefly outlining the changing realities of disasters. He pointed to growing urbanization and greater population density, particularly in fertile flood plains, resulting in people being more closely packed and thus less resilient because they are dependent on shared systems, thus necessitating changes in preparedness.



He pointed, as examples, to the need for expertise in such areas as information technology, mathematics and algorithms, mapping, accounting and understanding and management of financial markets. All of those have high value in the market, thus making them difficult for NGOs with tight resources. That in turn makes it more attractive to seek them through partnerships with business.

But, the question was raised, is it important or even relevant whether those people are volunteers? The reality, as one participant put it, is “we need people with expertise who are prepared to work effectively in our environment” whether that is on-the-ground in the middle of a disaster or remotely. “We need the skills we lack. If we want unskilled people, we hire locally.”

Whether it is “the company volunteering” – that is seconding employees to the NGO – or “the





individual volunteering” – that is, someone who has stepped forward on his or her own – is of much less importance than the skill and preparation the person brings.

As one participant said, “Volunteer’ has a broad definition. Who is a volunteer depends on the situation. From our perspective, they are not volunteers. They are

part of the workforce, unpaid by us but an expense to their company.”

At the same time, there was recognition that people do want to do something to help when a disaster occurs. Colin Rogers from CARE UK framed the challenge correctly:

*What is the “something” people can do? Is on-the-ground engagement useful or does it add to the chaos? We need a basket of options for them. The heat of the moment is not the best time to be deciding about what volunteers can do. What does it mean to volunteer to help? As valuable as being in the field, is to raise awareness of the disaster at home or to be an advocate on behalf of government action in response to the disaster.*

This led to a discussion about the need for greater clarity about what we mean when we talk about “volunteers.” What does it mean to NGOs? To companies? To the individuals involved? How, together, do we come to understand it and how do we utilize the range of capabilities that volunteers can bring?

## The Role of Technology

The role of technology was not a formal part of the agenda for the Dialogue. But it was raised throughout by the participants as an example of a potential resource that companies could assist in making available to the humanitarian community.

For example:

- There was discussion of how crowd sourcing was used in New Zealand to identify manual

labor needs and to map and manage response to those needs following the Christchurch earthquakes.

- One organization described using technology in Haiti to remotely analyze texts and emails, using students in the United States, to identify and map needs.
- In response to the question from a company about what can corporate employees do virtually to help, there was discussion of the potential to take advantage of time differences to engage volunteers in analyzing data that had been gathered by people in the field.
- The concept of a virtual emergency operations center was discussed as a way to help manage and productively channel grass roots response to disasters, a tool to move assets to where needs are and to avoid overload.

There was agreement on the need for continuing dialogue about the potential role of technology-based solutions to meet the needs of humanitarian agencies and for advanced, collaborative planning on how to develop and make available such solutions.

## Continuing the Dialogue

The London Dialogue was a first step for IAVE on this issue. It was clear from the participants that continuing dialogue between humanitarian agencies and leaders in corporate volunteering is a must. Through dialogue understanding and trust grow. It is the foundation for practical, collaborative work to enable both groups to work together effectively. Corporate-NGO volunteer



partnerships are vitally important in responding to the ongoing challenge of man-made and natural disasters throughout the world. IAVE is committed to working closely with those who joined us in the Dialogue to continue the work begun in London.



## Participants in the London Dialogue Session



|  |   |
|--|---|
| Eduardo Martinez, Chair The UPS Foundation, Chair (US) |   |
| Eugen Baldas   | Caritas Germany & IAVE Board of Directors (Germany) |
| John Berglund  | Salvation Army (US)                                 |
| Olaug Bergseth   | IFRC (Switzerland)                                  |
| Maryanne Burton  | British Red Cross (UK)                              |
| Lucia Dellagnelo                                       | ICOM-Institute Comunitario Grande (Brazil)          |
| Jelenko Dragisic                                       | Volunteering Queensland (Australia)                 |
| Ulrike Gehmacher                                       | Coca Cola (Austria)                                 |
| Carol Hatchett   | VSO (UK)  |
| Shaun Hazeldine  | IFRC (Switzerland)                                  |
| Clare Jenkinson  | Business in the Community (UK)                      |
| Sam Johnson  | Student Volunteer Army (New Zealand)                |
| Dr Kang Hyun Lee                                       | World President, IAVE (Korea)                       |
| Harmonie Limb  | Oxfam (UK)  |
| Graham MacKay  | Oxfam (UK)  |
| Diane Melley   | IBM (US)  |
| Paul Molinaro  | UNICEF (Belgium)                                    |
| Esther Ndichu  | UPS (Belgium)                                       |
| Matteo Perrone   | World Food Program (Italy)                          |
| Colin Rogers   | CARE (UK)   |
| Manabu Sakamoto  | Yamato Transport Company (Japan)                    |
| Masao Seki   | SOMPO Insurance (Japan)                             |
| Jane Smallman  | KPMG International (UK)                             |
| Yuisi Usui   | Yamato Transport Company (Japan)                    |



## The Interviews

Preparatory interviews were conducted with the following:

- British Red Cross
- Business in the Community (UK)
- CARE
- CARE UK
- Ericsson
- IBM
- International Federation of Red Cross Red Crescent
- KPMG International
- Oxfam
- Points of Light (US)
- Salvation Army
- Save the Children UK
- SOMPO Insurance (Japan)
- UNHCR
- UNICEF
- United Nations Volunteers
- UPS
- VSO (UK)
- World Food Program
- Yamato (Japan)

Input also was received from:

- C&A (Brazil)
- Student Volunteer Army (New Zealand)
- The Conference Board (US)
- Volunteering Queensland (Australia)

---

Dr. Kenn Allen, Senior Consultant to IAVE and President of the Civil Society Consulting Group LLC in Washington DC, conducted the preparatory research, assisted in facilitating the Dialogue session and prepared this report. Dr. Allen was lead researcher and primary author of the final report of IAVE's Global Corporate Volunteering Research Project and is author of *The Big Tent: Corporate Volunteering in the Global Age*, published by the Telefonica Foundation in English and Spanish. He can be reached at [kenn@civilsocietyconsulting.com](mailto:kenn@civilsocietyconsulting.com).



## Footnotes

1. Smith, Dennis. San Francisco Is Burning: The Untold Story of the 1906 Earthquake and Fires. New York: Viking, 2005.
2. Allen, Kenn, Monica Galiano and Sarah Hayes. Global Companies Volunteering Globally. Washington DC: IAVE – The International Association for Volunteer Effort, 2011.
3. Austin, James. Connecting with Nonprofits. Published October 1, 2001. Available on Working Knowledge website of Harvard Business School – <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/2489.html>.
4. Allen et al. Op. cit.
5. Allen et al. Op. cit.

## Photos

Photographs by Layton Thompson, <http://laytonthompson.com/>.

- Page 2. Left column. Eduardo Martinez, The UPS Foundation  
Right column. Sam Johnson, Student Volunteer Army (New Zealand) and John Berglund, Salvation Army (US)
- Page 3. Left column. Matteo Perrone, World Food Programme (Italy) and Esther Ndichu, UPS (Belgium)  
Right column. Masao Seki, SOMPO Insurance (Japan)
- Page 4. Left column. Diane Melley, IBM (US) and Eugen Baldas, Caritas and IAVE (Germany)  
Right column. Colin Rogers, CARE (UK)
- Page 5. Left column. Dr. Kang Hyun Lee, IAVE  
Right column. Olaug Bergseth, IFRC (Switzerland)
- Page 6. Left column. Kenn Allen, IAVE (US), and Eduardo Martinez, The UPS Foundation (US)  
Right column. John Berglund, Salvation Army (US); Carol Hatchett, VSO (UK); Jane Smallman, KPMG International (UK)
- Page 7. Left column top. Clare Jenkinson, Business in the Community (UK)  
Left column bottom. Paul Molinaro, UNICEF (Belgium)  
Right column top. Maryanne Burton, British Red Cross (UK)
- Page 8. Left column top. Graham MacKay, Oxfam (UK); Harmonie Limb, Oxfam (UK) and Clare Jenkinson, Business in the Community (UK)  
Left column bottom. Jelenko Dragisic, Volunteering Queensland (Australia)  
Right column. Lucia Dellagnelo, ICOM – Institute Comunitario Grande (Great Britain)
- Page 9. Left column top. Yuisi Usui, Yamato Transport Co. (Japan) and Manabu Sakamoto, Yamato Transport Co. (Japan)  
Right column bottom. Esther Ndichu, UPS (Belgium) and Eduardo Martinez, The UPS Foundation (US)
- Page 10. Top. Shaun Hazeldine, IFRC (Switzerland)







International Association for Volunteer Effort

