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Introduction

Over the course of early-2016, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC) partners have set in motion the updated Global Logistics Cluster Strategy for the next 3 years.

The Logistics Cluster Strategy 2016-2018 has four overarching goals that are integrated yet coherent at the global, regional, national and local level. One of the main goals underpinning the strategy is **preparedness**.

**Goal 1: PREPARE**

**Strengthen the immediate response capacity of national actors in disaster-prone countries and identify the best capacities for response.**

**Objective 1:** Strengthen logistics capacities on national and cross-border levels

**Objective 2:** Encourage active collaboration and ownership of tasks by LC community involving various actors such as civil protection, public and private sectors and other clusters.

The guidelines to achieve the above, centre around the following activities:

- Identify and prioritise 6 disaster-prone countries
- Map capacities and gaps with local stakeholders using existing and new protocols
- Develop scenarios based on risk analysis
- Assess disaster impacts on infrastructure & capacities
- Support government and stakeholders to address gaps
- Identify organisations & local actors to address gaps

All organisations face risks simply by virtue of operating in an increasingly uncertain environment. Resilience and risk management investments, do not only reduce the duration, likelihood and magnitude of events and disruptions, but also directly add value to all concerned parties in other ways. If and when disasters/disruptions happen, preparedness for response pays off in terms of both accelerated recovery and mitigated impacts. For this, early detection and early warning through network sensing, should lead to early action, shortening the duration of an event. Pre-organised teams with set plans and agreements, pre-configured supply and demand fulfilment channel systems, pre-stocked supplies and designated roles and responsibilities, all help accelerate a response.
Preparedness and Response are complementary aspects of risk management however, prevention can’t avoid all events that lead to disasters and response capabilities can’t mitigate all impacts to an acceptable level. It is therefore on the basis of a balance in various investments to the system which depends on the **trade-off between the cost of prevention, the cost of preparedness and the cost of response.** Prevention and preparedness reduces the likelihood of disaster losses; response reduces the consequences of disasters and detection/warning improves the effectiveness and timeliness of all three.

**Resiliency Investments in Preparedness Vs Insurance**
A direct Return on Investment (ROI) of insurance can only be measured when a disaster strikes. **Resiliency investments** however, are superior than insurance as they **promote system strengthening and economic multiplier effects,** even if no disaster event occurs, as it improves system performance, particularly **adept to the local supply chain sector.** Resiliency investments are as well focused on building internal capacities and capabilities of concerned entities whereas insurance focuses purely on a transfer of risk. Resiliency covers unknown and uncertain events and disasters whereas insurance covers predefined hazards.

Resiliency will improve the ability of local capacities and capabilities to withstand and recover from events and disasters but also to capitalise on events and disasters, therefore reinforcing resiliency at the local level. The activities that create resilience will also foster and improve collaboration, cooperation, coordination and communications in both directions of the response supply chain.

This document is aimed at professionals and key stakeholders as a means to develop a shared vision of resiliency boosting opportunities and strategies currently and in the long-term. The GLC Preparedness strategy is focused on localised resiliency boosting – in order to manage the impact of shocks, risk, uncertainty and change in the humanitarian ecosystem. Capacity strengthening will focus on ecosystem supply chain networks to absorb shocks, adapt to reduce shock exposure and risk transformation to reduce system impacts.

**Problem Statement**
The space of Preparedness in the Disaster Management cycle, has been developing in a myriad of ways for the different aid-system sectors. In the most recent past, since the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 46/182 (1999), as well as the steep learning curves of each emergency, for both the UN system and the aid-sector at large, Preparedness now finds itself at a conceptual crossroads between:

a) A singular focus on response and saving lives;
b) Pressure to expand and align with Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)/Disaster Risk Management (DRM) objectives.

The perpetual nature of response aid, although having saved many lives, is said to have left many stuck within a dependency cycle, lessening development gains and lowering multi-generational prospects for the worlds neediest. This is due to the fact that resiliency against future shocks are not built into the response system. DRR strategies and capacities are therefore more critical than ever, to help mitigate negative impacts on local, national and regional development and to lessen the demand and costs of response.
Preparedness is seen as a vital multi-dimensional activity that has the potential to bridge the Response-Development divide by taking its place as a key linkage between Emergency Management and DRR. When moving from the reactive approach of Disaster Management to the proactive approach of Disaster Risk Management, connecting the 3 key stages of Preparedness, Response and Recovery, is now the next logical and responsible step in the evolution of the sector. This is done by broadening our understanding, identification, anticipation, modification and mitigation of risk. Resilience boosting is a long-term process – strategies target specific societal systems and the underlying risks (supply chain specific) affecting them. Hence programme outcomes will affect context.

**Sectoral Frameworks**
This programme aims to build a long-term sustainable GLC Preparedness framework and strategy incorporating sectoral-related frameworks such as the Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Emergency Response Preparedness (EPR) framework and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 amongst others. The above frameworks have components and priorities related to understanding and profiling multi-hazard disaster risks, investing in resilience and enhancing preparedness and planning, as well as identifying and developing supply chain strategies, Minimum Preparedness Actions (MPA) and Advanced Preparedness Actions (APA), in relation to the response phase.

The GLC has conducted preparedness planning for many years, producing outstanding and sectoral-leading knowledge and strategies however at a wavering pace and quality, due to the absence of a framework, dedicated staff, strategies and multi-year funding to do so. Partner involvement in concept, design and execution has also been limited, as expected due to the many recent emergencies demanding immediate and sustained response focus, over long-term project focus.

**Project Approach**
Simultaneously, a much stronger emergence of Government-led emergencies, National Cluster systems, private sector networks, partner engagements and technologies has given rise to a new humanitarian landscape. Deeper and wider collaboration with all possible parties is seen as the best way to bridge inter- and intra-sectoral strengths with weaknesses and raise the sectors system-wide capacity and capability to respond.

Prevalent at present, is for international response to more effectively complement and support national authorities and local partners. For the GLC, the historical way of conducting Preparedness, now necessitates deeper capacity strengthening, networking, technical support, localisation and planning with national and local actors. Pre-defining and addressing response parameters, on-going initiatives and gaps in preparedness, protocols and agreements, should be maintained with the mind-set of ‘when’, and not ‘if’, a response would be needed. Any avenues to reduce either the costs and time to respond, deserve a concentrated view, ensuring that logistics bottlenecks do not become supply chain grid-lock in an emergency, as well as seeking and empowering partners that are best placed to respond.

**Preparedness and Resiliency**
Managing risks as a means to lower the need to manage disasters, results in resiliency. For GLC Preparedness, risks range from intrinsic supply chain partner risks to embedded supply network-design risks. Good preparedness involves a portfolio of options eg. supplier management, prepositioned inventory, capacity, resources and resource capability, logistics channel integration,
fulfillment modelling, flexibility and redundancy options to absorb supply and demand spikes (range forecasting) etc.

Starting with the end in mind, resiliency for GLC Preparedness is:

- **Standing Capacity**: current country supply chain self-sufficiency in capacities and capabilities (i.e. goods, services, equipment, infrastructure, systems, processes, procedures, knowledge, expertise) **PLUS**;
- **Absorptive Capacity**: what can be augmented through increasing Standing Capacity internally and externally to a country, **PLUS**;
- **Readiness**: Early detection, early warning and early response/action.

By identifying and lowering supply chain and logistics network vulnerabilities through risk reduction strategies, upstream, midstream and downstream to a particular region and country, system resiliency is increased. Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM), stemming from Enterprise Risk Management (ERM), is a way to incorporate Disaster Risk Reduction into Supply Chain and Logistics Preparedness. This in-turn makes the current state of generic Preparedness in the humanitarian sector, supply chain and logistics specific.

SCRM also helps increase performance on many operational dimensions by making entities less risk averse and therefore resilient. As entities become more resilient, the communities within which they reside become more resilient, and vice-versa.

**Capacity Strengthening and Localisation (Intervention Pull Vs Intervention Push)**

At present, international intervention remains for most part, as the entire Absorptive Capacity of a country, and to varying degree, a portion of a countries Standing Capacity, based on context, location and country risk vulnerability. International intervention is called upon to cover the gap in Standing Capacity – referred to as Intervention *Push*. International aid is therefore the default Absorptive Capacity provider. In this way under-detection leads to under-reaction and over-detection could lead to over-reaction of intervention time and scale.

Capacity strengthening, localisation and engaging with regional, national and local business networks would therefore be directly related to how and how much we are able to increase a countries Standing Capacity under self-sufficiency, as well as how and how much of the Absorptive Capacity we are able to augment and handover, to raise total Standing Capacity. By understanding and monitoring these levels of interaction between capacity points, an Intervention *Pull* system would be in place. We would therefore expect a direct relationship between a countries capacity to cope and known humanitarian needs, in relation to Absorptive and Standing Capacity, as well as an inverse relationship with capacity to cope and lead time, timeline and scale of an international intervention.

Ultimately, the GLC preparedness strategy aims to lower both the time and cost of a large-scale humanitarian emergency by:

- Capacity and capability building of first responders closer to points of demand;
- Lower supply chain and logistics risks;
- Pre-define response mechanisms;
- Utilise the cluster platform to increase preparedness and response economies of scale, scope, density and frequency.
Supply Chain Risk Management
By bridging the relief to development continuum, the above approach aims to utilise the following supply chain risk management protocols:

- **Proactive Risk Management**: Decrease the likelihood (probability) of a supply chain risk event - Identify all level supply-chain and logistics risks for proactive management and investment;
- **Incident Management**: Minimise the negative consequences of a supply chain event post-occurrence – Pre-define and solidify international GLC response intervention configurations and agreements;
- **Risk avoidance, risk transfer**: Advocacy for residual risks.

To conduct risk management, right-size and professionally plan a logistics network, supply and demand fundamentals are required to stress-test configurations and interrelatedness between network nodes and this in-turn requires joint scenario-driven analysis to determine expected demand fulfilment models, supply networks and shortfalls.

GLC Preparedness will perform this function for expected participating partner and government configurations where possible, in 6 pilot priority countries listed below:

1) Haiti  
2) Indonesia  
3) Bangladesh  
4) Myanmar  
5) Nigeria  
6) Madagascar

For an explanation of the above 6 choices, review the document ‘Survey Note’ - April 2016.
GLC Resiliency Driven Preparedness Framework
The GLC Resiliency Driven Preparedness Framework, consists of a Supply Chain Resiliency Programme (SCRP), using a Supply Chain Resiliency Analysis (SCRA) process for the 6 priority countries, underpinned by a Theory of Change and Logical Framework to monitor, learn and evaluate the pilot programme. The framework will be used to identify and manage system risks and to better inform Preparedness, Response and Contingency Planning and has the following overarching aims:

- Providing a Rationale for Engagement
- Explaining the Delivery of Processes (Structure & Communication Flows)
- Clarifying Expected Results (Outputs/Outcomes/Indicators)
- Providing Timeline of Key Milestones
- Promoting Risk Sharing Partnerships (Cluster Ownership: Enabling capacity tasting and capacity reservation)
- Providing a Business Case

Common Outputs and Common Outcomes
A jointly executed GLC Resiliency Driven Preparedness Programme will:

- Build soft assets, knowledge and processes to manage events that have not yet happened;
- Better inform/update the generation of Preparedness/Response/Contingency Plans per country;
- Map partner supply and demand scenario-set expectations and pre-identify logistics channels;
- Identify gaps in existing initiative integration for treatment and investment;
- Pre-define response arrangements & supply chain configurations at:
  - Strategic (Global)
  - Tactical (Regional) &
  - Operational (National/Local) levels;
- Help:
  - Support and integrate National Clusters and NDMO/RDMO/LEMA into the Logistics Cluster system;
  - Support UNCT/HCT and other clusters;
  - Engage with and better collaborate with multi-level Private Sector Networks;
  - Localise Preparedness with Business Continuity Principles;
  - Increase Readiness levels (early detection, early warning and early action);
- Increase sectoral network effects through:
  - Provision of a Preparedness Platform
  - Provision of trainings and simulations based on predetermined scenarios and response plans;
- Generate/update Cluster MPA’S and APA’s (applicable to non-priority countries);
- Bridge the response-development divide;
- Incorporate DRR in Preparedness, Response and Recovery stages;
- Further professionalize the sector.
**Supply Chain Resiliency Programme (SCRP)**

The SCRP is to primarily identify, recommend, prioritise, and track supply chain risk mitigation, modification and transfer efforts that are expected to be executed by GLC Preparedness Working Group partners and networks at the global, regional and national levels (‘Whole of Society’ approach), over the next 3 years of the strategy.

**GLOBAL LOGISTICS CLUSTER**

Resilience Driven Preparedness
Supply Chain Resiliency Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>IMPLEMENT</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONALISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>0-6 months</td>
<td>6-36 months</td>
<td>Perpetual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>Supply Chain Resiliency Programme Definition &amp; Proof of Concept</th>
<th>Roll-Out SCRP</th>
<th>SCRP fully adapted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td>Whole of Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS</td>
<td>Risk Management System</td>
<td>Supply Chain Resiliency Analysis Definition &amp; Proof of Concept</td>
<td>Roll-Out SCRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE</td>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Tools Defined and Developed</td>
<td>Tools Deployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tools Defined and Developed</td>
<td>Tools Defined and Developed</td>
<td>Tools Deployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement/Localisation</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>ET-Bus Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiatives/Mapping</td>
<td>Initiative and Partner Mapping Initiated</td>
<td>Continuous Mapping and Initiative Integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supply Chain Resiliency Analysis (SCRA)**

The SCRA is a live process underpinned by continuous improvement through frequent feedback loops. It is intended for usage by Working Group field mission teams to guide supply chain risk management and resiliency building assessments, activities and to better inform Preparedness, Response and Contingency Planning.

**Phase 1 and 2 (Identify and Quantify)** are for ascertaining the status of Standing Capacity.

**Phase 3 and 4 (Mitigate and Respond)** are for ascertaining the Absorptive Capacity requirements and investments. The analysis process is highly flexible to contexts and includes business continuity planning (envisioned for regional, national and local logistics service providers (3PL’s) as a means for preparedness and resiliency) localisation and connect Preparedness, Response and Recovery phases of the DRM cycle.

Phase 4 covers *Respond*, event monitoring and the tactical response/international Cluster intervention in the form of pre-designated live, shared and agreed response arrangements of a Response Plan.

**Coordination (Strategic/Tactical/Operational)**: Utilising the best-in-class practices of Collaborative Planning, Forecasting and Response (CPFR), supply chain control towers and virtual teaming, response arrangements between cluster partners are envisioned to form into three integrated core-cells:

- Supply sensing;
- Demand sensing and fulfilment modelling;
- End-to-end logistics integration.

[www.logcluster.org](http://www.logcluster.org)
Project Management, Mapping and Risk protocol tools that will be developed for the above analysis are:

- GLC Preparedness Webpage, and Preparedness Platform
- Preparedness & Response Plan templates and guidance
- Partner Initiative Mapping Tool and Guidance (under Preparedness Platform)
- National Disaster Management Framework (NDMF) Analysis Tool
- Risk Assessment and Monitoring Dashboard
- Advocacy Strategy
- Project Management Tools (in-house monitoring of field implementation)
- Ratio Guidance: Days of Supply (DOS) & Time to Recovery (TTR)
- Bowtie Risk Analysis (Fault/Event Tree Analysis – under Simulation tools if/when developed)
- Business Continuity Guidance and Assessment Tool (partner assistance required)
GLC Preparedness Platform & Webpage

Data preparedness and information readiness are key enablers of the GLC Preparedness pilot project strategy. The aim of the GLC Preparedness Platform is to provide a dynamic overview and analysis of existing Preparedness initiatives on-going both globally and locally to project countries as well as field-level partner logistics capacities (ref. Preparedness Platform Concept Note – Nov2016). There is a multitude of supply chain preparedness initiatives and field capacities/capabilities, however cross-sectoral visibility does not exist leading to a duplication of efforts, untended gaps and undetected synergies. The platform aims to create visibility of the supply chain and logistics preparedness ecosystem. Still in the beta testing and design phase, the preparedness webpage will develop from a basic repository and portal to a Preparedness Platform. Partners and field missions will be able to instantly upload and geo-tag their capacities and capabilities – allowing for a more robust, interactive and informative presentation of the current situation in project countries.

Collaboration Enablement
In a system where collaboration is a precursor to coordination, a formal ecosystem and network linkage enhancement platform is required. The Platform can be used to promote multi-sectoral collaboration and assess the function, characteristics and success factors of eventual collaboration models between and amongst participating GLC partners, Governmental and inter-governmental entities, other regional, national and local actors, private sector entities, resiliency system investors (donors), institutions and academia. The Platform will explore how to engage and link with other platforms through Application Programming Interfaces’ where feasible and appropriate.

A Niche Supply Chain Preparedness Innovation
The platform will fill a clear gap in the inter-sectoral preparedness coordination space and through the innovation, enhances the GLC Preparedness strategy activities, awareness, promotion and information dissemination. As data size and quality increases, adoption rates rise and promote supply chain thought leadership through creating visibility for integrative operational opportunities, shared knowledge and learning retention. The platform could be used by partners to map individual organisational supply chain networks for in-house cross-divisional planning, firewallled if required. The platform will aim to facilitate capacities surplus and deficit matching and guide optimum allocation and pooling of resources for joint problem solving. It aims to assist multi-sectoral partners to gain a shared understanding of preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction for resiliency efforts. It will assist with aligning humanitarian preparedness activities with development initiatives as well as being a ‘tool-on-hand’ to facilitate the engagement of value-adding non-traditional actors in humanitarian efforts.

Platform Benefits
- Network visibility of in-country preparedness actors able to quickly identify logistics gaps with immediate field based response capacity. Response stakeholders will have access to a wealth of regional and in-country logistics knowledge and data to draw upon (DLCA, preparedness country-level working group minutes, pertinent preparedness documentation, guidance, operational & response plans, shipping info etc.) and which can be incorporated quickly into planning scenarios and response actions;
- Provide the ability to create models, compare and evaluate different scenarios and analyse the impacts of different scenarios;
- System users could model their own supply chain networks and run analytics tools against planning

www.logcluster.org
efforts, internally in their organisations and share as necessary;
- A seamless transition from preparedness to response actions on a single platform;
- Strengthen the coordination between National Disaster Management Organisations, Private Sector Humanitarian Platforms, National Clusters and the Humanitarian & Development sector through sharing country level data, locally produced information, visibility of local partners, assets and spare capacities, and assist in policy development and impact investments.

Data quality and partner participation in the platform is vital. Apart from supply and logistics data, the platform will aim to model cost flows where possible (data dependent), as a means to improve visibility and accountability, and allow for logistics network optimisation including taking advantage of environmental efficiencies where possible and feasible. The aim of modelling and simulation tools will be to provide a platform to the wider humanitarian community for individual and joint use, as well as search for supply chain gridlock prevention avenues within and between:

- Network Integration: Logistics Gaps
- Node Velocity: Flow Bottlenecks
Concrete Implementation Examples:

- **Preparedness Coordination** – initiating, enabling and maintaining *Logistics Sector Working Groups* at the field level, representative of *Humanitarian partners, Development partners, Government partners and Private Sector partners*;

- Conduct a *pre-emergency joint-Preparedness exercise* by pre-empting partner decisions and actions to be taken up to one week prior to an emergency and up to one week after an emergency, using the Logistics Cluster *Minimum and Advanced Preparedness Actions* guidance;

- Based on the Preparedness exercise and prevailing scenarios, conduct, compile and monitor a *joint Preparedness Plan and Response Plan* – utilising 3 intensity & impact increasing thresholds eg.100 000 – 500 000 people affected in 3 key areas/500 000 – 1m affected in 5 key areas etc.;

- Where appropriate and possible, conduct a Government capacities and capabilities analysis to find where capacity building could be conducted and build these networks;

- Conduct multi-partner including Government *trainings and Response Plan simulation exercises* in order to enhance coordination, collaboration and operational capacity for emergency response to improve local and national capacities to manage supply-chain aspects of...
emergency operations (based on Cluster common scenario and preparedness and response plans); to forge relationships and test & familiarise stakeholders with each other's interoperable/interconnected processes);

- **Information Readiness and Data Preparedness**: develop the **GLC Preparedness Platform** (ref. Preparedness Platform Concept Note – Oct 2016) to conduct **mapping**/identify **organisations and capacities** best placed to respond to scenarios/map capacities and gaps with local stakeholders/rapid analysis for decision making;
- Develop and launch the **GLC Preparedness Webpage** to support and disseminate Preparedness related information and encourage partnerships;
- **Monitor, evaluate and learn** from this approach to GLC Preparedness for future core-service application.

**Expected Outcomes**

- **Preparedness Coordination**: Field-level Preparedness coordination forum, with partners jointly mitigating scenario based gaps and risks, prior to disaster onset;
- **Preparedness Information Management**: Widely known information on immediately available logistics capacities, skills and ready-made relationships fostered within Log Cluster partners at the field-level (contributes to immediate, quicker and cheaper response capacity). Such information helps define where field-level response capacity becomes exhausted and where the response system should pivot towards regional and international capacities.
- **Pre-defined Response Arrangements**: Widely known and simulated response scenarios facilitate individual partner, Cluster/Sector and Inter-Cluster/Sector supply chain planning and arrangements – this lowers both operational costs and time to respond as supply chain decisions and logistics arrangements are pre-empted;
- **Improved Response System Efficacy & Transparency**: Ground level realities being rapidly known by global level decision makers and major supply chain risk mitigation prioritisation of an ongoing nature.
GLC Preparedness Structure/Project Building Blocks & Stakeholders

The programme scope visual above will run within and expand upon the GLC’s current stakeholder ecosystem. With localisation and national authority support as the prerogative, national level coordination of the programme is vital, with support, guidance and funding from the global to the local level. Where possible and applicable, South-South cooperation will be promoted. The linkages between the global level working groups and local level working groups will follow a flexible structure, allowing for empowered autonomy under clear roles and responsibilities, distributed authority and rapid decision making processes. Governance and programme decision making will be communication driven and hence allow for sustainable scaling of community objectives and a self-organising agile structure of the programme within and beyond the pilot programme.
The GLC Preparedness Stakeholder Ecosystem
Preparedness & Response Plan Training
(Training/Response Plan Drills, Rehearsals and Simulations)
Once Response Plans and supply chain configurations have been agreed upon, training and drilling of the specific country plans are essential. By all partners versing themselves with the scenarios, capacities, capabilities and processes of each other, particular to a country, a network is built and the relationships between the network members is streamlined and strengthened. The aim is thus not only preparedness and response training in itself, but training and simulation as a catalyst for network strengthening, and as a localized capacity building enabler. Simulating plans will reveal where procedures and processes fall short of the optimum response potential and structure. Structure can create flexibility and agility, as opposed to rigidity when well-trained teams have the authority to adapt their training to new situations. Coupled with empowerment, setting out response baselines are key to flexible operations – as they enable risk pooling of assets and surge capacity while empowering frontline responders to improvise when conditions change.

Training in the form of Response Plan drills (simulation and desktop format) would entail a multi-party and multi-level effort inclusive of the NDMO/LEMA/Civil Protection counterpart, National Cluster counterpart if available, Private Sector representatives, Regional Organisations, INGO’s, NGO’s, UN and other clusters. Training and drills would take place at the field level, with a regional link as well as a global link - mirroring an emergency reality, where corporate levels are involved.

The benefits of this would be:
- To stress test preparedness and response plans;
- To strengthen collaborative decision making prior to an emergency, instead of after an emergency arises;
- Assigning roles and responsibilities as well as promote clarity and understanding regarding those different roles and responsibilities;
- Increase and strengthen networking amongst response teams and partners;
- Improve relationship links with governments and NDMO’s at national level;
- Improves governments and NDMO’s capacity to respond to small and medium crises themselves, and eventually, large crises with predefined international intervention;
- Decreases local vulnerabilities and raises resiliency of localized systems on the basis of knowledge transfer from global to local levels;
- Increased visibility within communities of the partnerships and linkages;
- Increase early detection, early warning and early action capabilities;
- Increases readiness levels of communication, collaboration, cooperation and coordination in preparation of a potential response.

By maintaining a training regimen of once or twice a year, this will allow the network established to strengthen linkages as well as periodically revise and update plans and scenarios’, critical to the projects Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation (MLE) feedback components. This collaborative process is where time and money would be saved with a subsequent increase in accountability and transparency.
A training and drill simulation would need to be developed, based on the collaboratively drafted response plan and expected scenarios in a particular country. The blueprint, after initial drafting, would then be adapted to the other countries, lowering the overall cost of the package, whilst country resiliency will improve with each session.

Theory of Change and Log Frame
As the project intends to promote resiliency of local capacities within the GLC preparedness, response and recovery ecosystem, including bridging the humanitarian-development continuum in the long term, the project would ultimately require and aim for change to happen from its current global network and relationship driven model, to localized initiatives.

To ensure quality programme design, monitoring, learning and evaluation, a Theory of Change (ToC) is required to inform actions and activities in all stages of the project cycle including stimulating a systematic reflection on key aspects, such as:

- the goal and objectives of the programme;
- the causal linkages between GLC activities and the desired outcomes;
- the main risks/assumptions around the validity of those causal linkages;
- the linkages with other local ongoing initiatives

Directly related to the above, the ToC process will provide a solid conceptual model on which to develop an effective Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation framework and Log Frame. A ToC will allow GLC partner organizations to clearly articulate and communicate their contribution to the GLC Preparedness Programme, applicable outcomes of the World Humanitarian Summit 2016 and the Sustainable Development Goals to the wider stakeholder group.

The ToC will comprise of two components: A visual representation of the results chain, and a narrative component articulating the underlying logical model.
The results chain identified in the ToC model will include: outputs, immediate outcomes, intermediate outcomes, strategic outcomes and impacts, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT-TERM CHANGES</th>
<th>MEDIUM-TERM CHANGES</th>
<th>LONG-TERM CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLC OUTPUTS</td>
<td>IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES</td>
<td>INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STRATEGIC OUTCOMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A narrative table as part of the log frame, outlined below will complement the ToC model visual:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXPLANATION OF THE CAUSAL LINKAGES</th>
<th>UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS</th>
<th>STRENGTH OF THE AVAILABLE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation (MLE)
Continuous Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation is a key component of the preparedness projects 3-year strategy. By incorporating long term learning and M&E into the project ToC and Log Frame, the project aims to strengthen and continually improve its framework, strategies, effectiveness and impacts at the local, national, regional and global level.

**Monitoring**: Continuous project information and data collection, Preparedness Platform expansion and promotion, strategic context analysis, integrated SCRA feedback loops, information and communications management and project management tools.

**Evaluation**: Analysis and interpretation of monitoring data, risk protocol tool analysis, and the evaluation of scenarios, response simulations and lessons learned. A partner risk maturity and resiliency index will be established on the bases on input data. It will be used as a gauge of the programme changes from established baselines to expected outcome, outputs and impacts.

**Learning**: Based on the above monitoring, learning and evaluation framework and tool sets, develop evidence-based preparedness policies, guidance and activities to frame global and local preparedness strategies and decision-making

**Programme Sustainability and Investment/Funding Model**
As the programme is not a static exercise, nor does it have linear processes, programme risk mitigation requires a long-term view, underpinned by a dedicated core-team and solidified by long-term multi-year investment. Investment and funding will be required for programme sustainability at two levels:

- **Global Level** – to build, maintain and sustain the multi-partner, multi-year pilot programme;
- **Regional/National/Local Level** – once supply chain resilience initiative gaps and unmitigated risks are auto-prioritised in a common theatre - specific, targeted and timely investments will be required to lower system vulnerability and raise local resiliency. Although initially targeted for 6 priority countries, however if imminent and glaring supply chain risks and initiative gaps are found in other potential high-risk countries, mitigation, advocacy and awareness of such, will also be raised.

For further information, please contact:

**Faheem Araie**
Global Logistics Cluster Preparedness Officer, WFP Rome, Italy: Faheem.arai @wfp.org

**Stephen Cahill**
Global Logistics Cluster Coordinator, WFP Rome, Italy: Stephen.cahill@wfp.org

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