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10 November

8:30-9:00 | Coffee

9:00-10:30 | Working Group- Governance

10:30-11:00 | Coffee Break

11:30-12:30 | Working Group- Financial Demystification
12:30-13:30 | Lunch Break

13:30-14:30 | ERCC / Sessions (ESUPS, C&M+KPI)

14:30-15:00 | Coffee Break

15:00-16:30 | Working Groups- Preparedness and Budget Strategy
16:30-17:30 | Parking Lot Discussions
17:30      | Daily Wrap Up
WORKING GROUP - GOVERNANCE
Governance Working Group

GLOBAL LOGISTICS CLUSTER
Session plan

Introduction & background (20’)

Breakout groups:

1. Scope of the SAG (20’)
2. Objectives of the SAG (20’)
3. ToRs + activities (20’)

**ALL:** Membership, voting & inclusion: (20’)

- The rotation of the SAG and Chair of the SAG (length of time on the SAG)
- Membership and who will be able to vote for members of the SAG
- How do we ensure variety of members in the SAG?
- How to include national NGO’s in the SAG?

**ALL:** Presentation of each group (10’)

Introduction

Why have a SAG?

◦ Logistics cluster is growing rapidly
◦ Decision making needs to become more collaborative (without affecting operational response)
◦ Higher interest & formalised input by partner
◦ Ownership by partners
◦ Burden sharing by partners
Background

Source ToRs:
- Global Nutrition Cluster
- Global WASH Cluster
- Shelter Cluster Somalia
- Global Health Cluster
- Global Early Recovery Cluster
- Global Food Security Cluster
Background

Working group talking points June – November 2016:

- Why do we need to discuss governance of the Logistics Cluster
- Different approaches to the SAG
- For/against SAG
- Composition and selection of SAG
- SAG ToR
- SAG objectives & scope
Expected outcomes for today

1) Agreement on the requirement for a SAG

2) If agreed – outline of the constitution of SAG
   - Structure and objectives
   - ToR
   - System of voting
   - Clarity on members and what that means
1. Scope of SAG

MEETINGS

Once a quarter (SCSom)
4 x year (GHC)
2 x year alongside GM; phone/skype meetings ad hoc (GNC)
ToR reviewed annually (not clear where/when/by whom)

OPERATING PROCEDURES

Decisions based on broad consensus
Decisions recorded in minutes (Chatham House rules)
Agenda & minutes published on GLC website
Report to GM on activities and accomplishments

SAG responsibilities and area of operation are mentioned either as ‘roles and responsibilities’ or as part of the ToR
2. SAG Objectives

**FACT-FINDING**

GHC: provide strategic guidance; monitor performance; oversee implementation of workplan; support functions as appropriate. Coordinator functional reporting line to SAG.

SCSom: Policy & strategic direction; technical support; advocacy & advisory; coordination & improvement of

GNC: work on activities defined at annual meeting or in SAG meetings; supportive advice to LC cell specific issues; annual meeting objectives; content; GLC workplans; formation of task forces; monitoring workplan; fundraising strategy and proposal development (global level)

**PROPOSED GLC MODEL**

Strategic direction
- Policies
- Workplan
- Partnerships
- Oversight

Monitoring

Participation/inclusion

Feedback

Advocacy
2. SAG Objectives

The objective of the Global Logistics Cluster (GLC) Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) is to provide strategic support and guidance to the GLC and facilitate accountability to its partners building in particular on the annual review of GLC performances.

The objective of the SAG is as well the representation of the diversity of partners relying on the LC within the LC strategic management.
2. SAG Objectives

More specifically, the GLC SAG members will commit to:

• Endorse and advocate/promote for the multi annual strategy towards donors and within the international community.

• Advise on Global Logistics Cluster priorities

• Monitor the work of GLC Task Teams and projects related to the GLC

• propose the establishment of Project Steering Groups to work on identified priorities

• Review and approve annual work plan, and agree amendment to these work plans as necessary during the course of the year

• Approve global GLC policies
2. SAG Objectives

Additional objectives to discuss:

• Review on an annual basis funds allocation and report to the GLC

• In consultation with the cluster lead, review the profiles of the Global cluster cell team before recruitment

• Advocate to deploy additional staff capacity to the GLC Unit as needed to support the activities of the GLC work plan (Active participation of the SAG members)

• Support performance of the logistics clusters at country level through participation in the Planning and roll out of the Cluster Performance Monitoring Tool (we have one of those?)

• Assist in the development and approval of agendas for meetings of Global Logistics Cluster
3. SAG ToR & Activities

Proposed GLC model

- Strategic support and guidance to the GLC Unit to guide direction of GLC policies, products and work plan
- provides necessary guidance to GLC to address field-based Cluster needs
- facilitates inclusive participation of all Cluster partners
- reviews the annual reports of the GLC and provides necessary inputs and feedback
- assists the GLC in identifying and addressing gaps and trends in humanitarian policy and practice that could impact service delivery in sudden onset and protracted crises
- assists in the development and approval of agendas for the GLC meetings
- supports development and elaboration of the GLC statements and position papers/proofs papers? Provides final approval? Advice? What is ‘support’ – material/financial/personnel/information?
- assists the GLC in defining strategic partnerships with relevant partners/ agreeing the relevance or something about due diligence on those partners and whether all members agree to partner with them?
- Supports the GLC for monitoring the performance of Logistics Clusters at the country level through participation in after action reports and design of monitoring tools
- Monitor the work of GLC Task Teams and projects related to the GLC (this might be a general member one rather than SAG? Or SAG gets detailed discussion time and reports are presented to GM?)
4a. Rotation and Chair

**FACT-FINDING**

**Shelter Cluster Somalia** – Chaired by the Coordinator; SAG members have ‘constituents’.

**Global Health Cluster** – two co-chairs, one WHO, other elected by SAG members. 2 year seat.

**Global Nutrition Cluster** – chair nominated by SAG members; rotate every 3 months; any member can chair.

**Global Food Security Cluster** – chair and co-chair; nominated by SAG members; duration of service up to 12 months, can be extended by SAG agreement.

**PROPOSED GLC MODEL**

2 year ‘seat’ on the SAG

SAG members strive for the best output for the Log Cluster and ALL its members.

First Chair elected within SAG members

Chair changes every 6 months
4b. Membership and Voting

FACT-FINDING

Individuals interested need relevant work experience; application for membership & vote.

Represent interests of cluster not own interests.

Membership selected on annual basis through call for interest;

Membership criteria to be met.

Organisational level membership.
  ◦ Must have been a cluster partner for 12 months or more (organisation);
  ◦ Interested agency submits EoI and identify individual;

can be independent;

two SAG members retained each time;
election 1 vote per agency (online).

PROPOSED GLC MODEL

No required membership for GLC
  ◦ Presence at GMs

No quorate at GLC GMs

One representative per organisation or organisational family can vote.

SAG members are nominated and seconded
  ◦ Before GM/at GM first day

Vote on nominations by secret ballot

Simple count decides
4c. Variety of Members

**FACT-FINDING**

**Global Health Cluster** – 1 WHO, 1 other UN, 4 NGO/non-UN, 1 academic, 1 donor, 1 HC coordinator, 1 WHO regional office rep. (10)

**Global Nutrition Cluster** – UNICEF programme rep; 1 other UN; 2 NGO/operating agency; Country Cluster Coord. (5)

**Global Food Security Cluster** – 1 permanent from each co-lead (WFP & FAO); 3 NGO; 1 global coord; 1 field coord. (7)

**Global WASH Cluster**; 1 UNICEF; 1 other UN; 1 international agency, 1 agency or individual representing regional or country level (7)

**Early Recovery Cluster**; Permanent: UNDP & OCHA; Rotating: UN Agencies & NGOs (9)

**Shelter Cluster Somalia** – Cluster lead; 2 UN; 2 large INGO & 1 small INGO; 2 national NGO; IOM co-lead; REACH member. Observers – protection cluster co, donor rep & OCHA rep. (10)

**PROPOSED GLC MODEL**

- Lead agency
- Other UN
- Field cluster coordinators (possibly non-voting)
- NGO
- Global cluster coordinators (observer)
- Other (observer)
- Total (voting) 7
- Total (present) 9
SAG composition

- Field Cluster Coordinator: 1
- Global Cluster Coordinator: 1
- Lead Agency: 2
- NGO: 1
- Other UN: 4
Voting composition

SAG voting members

- Lead
- Agency
- NGO
- Other
- UN
4d. Inclusiveness

FACT-FINDING

SCSom – including National NGO.

GNC – cluster aim to build capacity of national NGOs not stated on SAG or cluster membership.

PROPOSED GLC MODEL

Now – current attendees of GM, meeting-by-meeting basis

Future –
  ◦ Work towards wider participation in GMs
  ◦ View to include national representation in the next round of voting.
Next steps

Final edit of proposed GLM SAG ToR based on feedback from today
  ◦ Shared with GLM attendees (past and present)

Agreement by ‘negative consensus’ – if you don’t speak up, agreement is assumed.

Next meeting – nomination & voting on members of first SAG and initial setup.
2016 LOGISTICS CLUSTER OPERATIONS

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO
ECUADOR
ETHIOPIA
FIJI
HAITI
IRAQ
NEPAL
NIGERIA
PAPUA NEW GUINEA
SYRIA
SOMALIA
SOUTH SUDAN
UKRAINE
YEMEN
2016 SPECIAL OPERATIONS

Graph showing the financial status of various countries.

- CAR: 70% Received + Carry Over, 30% Unfunded
- DRC: 70% Received + Carry Over, 30% Unfunded
- Ethiopia: 50% Received + Carry Over, 50% Unfunded
- Haiti: 60% Received + Carry Over, 40% Unfunded
- Iraq: 90% Received + Carry Over, 10% Unfunded
- Nigeria: 100% Received + Carry Over
- South Sudan: 70% Received + Carry Over, 30% Unfunded
- Syria: 60% Received + Carry Over, 40% Unfunded
- Ukraine: 80% Received + Carry Over, 20% Unfunded
- Yemen: 90% Received + Carry Over, 10% Unfunded
### 2016 SPECIAL OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient Country</th>
<th>Requirements 2016</th>
<th>Received + Carry over</th>
<th>Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>$11,977,745</td>
<td>$11,498,318</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$8,510,422</td>
<td>$8,510,423</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>$26,185,095</td>
<td>$24,477,215</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>$11,482,115</td>
<td>$7,560,866</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>$2,435,610</td>
<td>$2,155,586</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>$10,202,465</td>
<td>$10,202,465</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>$2,734,534</td>
<td>$1,864,422</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>$1,094,007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>$1,580,831</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>$5,273,376</td>
<td>$2,838,735</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$81,476,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,108,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2017 SPECIAL OPERATIONS

#### Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient Country</th>
<th>Requirements 2017</th>
<th>Carry over from 2016</th>
<th>Funded 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>$12,140,171</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>$5,066,359</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>$26,889,730</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>$4,789,239</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>$1,369,756</td>
<td>$670,215</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>$3,293,957</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>$874,342</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,303,558</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,170,215</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note, following the presentation during the meeting, new data has been confirmed and figures updated accordingly.*
IRAQ SPECIAL OPERATION (2015 - 2016)

Operational Costs
- MSU purchases 21%
- Armored Vehicles 11%
- Airlifts related costs 9%
- ISC 9%
- WH related costs 50%

Staff related costs
- Payroll 40%
- Travel 60%

Operational Costs - $4,428,634
Staff cost - $1,408,243
## 2016 MAIN DONORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>$41,247,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>$14,814,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>$7,417,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Funding</td>
<td>$6,797,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$5,537,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>$1,155,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$749,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$264,644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing donor distribution]

- USA: 53%
- UK: 19%
- UN Funding: 9%
- Germany: 7%
- Sweden: 1%
- Japan: 1%
- Private: 0%
- European Commission: 9%
- Canada: 9%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient Country</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>European Commission</th>
<th>UN Funding</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
<td>14,814,936</td>
<td>1,690,898</td>
<td>1,900,003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71,378</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>143,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,253,796</td>
<td>1,045,695</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>829,349</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>97,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>208,650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4,517,060</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86,607</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,893,900</td>
<td>5,537,908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>903,258</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>167,865</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>6,730,621</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,569,507</td>
<td>1,749,499</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>749,064</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,247,681</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,814,936</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,417,459</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,797,747</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,537,908</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,155,198</strong></td>
<td><strong>$749,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$264,644</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LUNCH BREAK

Session will re-start at 13:30
VISIT TO ERCC

SESSIONS ON ESUPS, CASH AND MARKETS AND KPIs
Sector-Wide KPI Project

Logistics Cluster Meeting
Background

2004  Discussion @ Humanitarian Logistics Conference

2012  Working Group formed

2014  Funded by USAID
Standardized KPIs address key issues

1. Link SCM strategic objectives to organization’s mandate and priorities
2. Need for Management support for SCM
3. Establish internal targets based on “best-in-class” examples
4. Improve cooperation with counterparts
5. Ability to demonstrate improvement over time
Project Vision

Stakeholders can communicate value of supply chain management within their organizations based on quantitative data and use benchmarking to influencing continuous improvement.
Working Group

Provides strategic direction, prioritizes the selection of the KPIs and lends support to operationalizing the KPIs for the project

- CRS
- Médecins Sans Frontières
- Mercy Corps
- Oxfam
- Save the Children
- World Vision Int’l
- British Red Cross
- IFRC
- ICRC
- UNICEF
- UNHCR
- WFP
Fritz Institute’s Role

1 COORDINATION

- Coordinate and facilitate Working Group
- Design prototype framework, KPIs, tools, and guidance based on agreed priorities
- Lead and manage testing process
- Propose and reach agreement on common framework
- Plan for long-term project sustainability

2 CONSULTATION

- Assist organizations in aligning Sector-wide KPIs with their strategic objectives and existing management systems
- Support assessment of feasibility and implementation requirements
- Help resolve obstacles and constraints to implementation
We asked:

“Which model will help us best achieve the objectives of standardized KPIs?”

**OPTIONS:**

1. Adopt SCOR or Balanced Scorecard framework

2. Adopt a lead organization’s framework

3. Hybrid

**CONSENSUS:**

Adopt Balanced Scorecard
Humanitarian Balanced Score Card

5 PERSPECTIVES:

- Beneficiary
- Constituent
- Financial
- Learning & Innovation
- Internal Operations
- Compliance

SUPPLY CHAIN VISION & STRATEGY
How do we create positive impact for our beneficiaries?

What do our constituents do to serve beneficiaries?

EXAMPLE KPI:
% of beneficiaries reached vs. planned beneficiaries served
If the supply chain organization succeeds, how will we contribute to value for money?

EXAMPLE KPI:
Average value of stocks vs the value dispatched in a time period
EXAMPLE KPI:
% of audit findings related to SC

To satisfy constituents and donors, how do we best manage supply chain compliance?
How can our supply chain organization continue to mature and change to meet evolving demands?

EXAMPLE KPI:
% of SC staff with industry-related certification qualification
To satisfy constituents and donors, at which supply chain processes do we need to excel?

EXAMPLE KPI: % of line items received within agreed timeframe
Logic Model: Value of KPIs

- Inputs: What do we use to do our work?
- Activities: What do we do?
- Outputs: What do we produce/deliver?
- Outcomes: What do we wish to achieve?
- Impacts: What are we aiming to change?
Value of KPIs

VALUE: Shows *how* inputs and activities are linked to outcomes and impacts
1. % of line items received within agreed timeframe

**VALUE:** DEPENDABILITY: Improve link to Program to ensure right product, right time, right supply chain

**DETAILS:**

- **PURPOSE:** Program creates short term and long term plans based on realistic lead time, cost and funds available
- **NUMERATOR:** # of line items within agreed timeframe
- **DENOMINATOR:** Total # of line items
- **LEVEL:** Country Office
- **FREQUENCY:** Monthly
**Project Phases**

**PHASE 1**
- Define & develop framework – H-BSC
- Identify initial KPIs for testing

**PHASE 2**
- Test initial KPIs with pilot organizations
- Refine initial KPIs
- Build out balance of KPIs for framework

**PHASE 3**
- Testing of full set of H-BSC KPIs
- Develop toolbox for implementation
- Establish platform for long-term housing
- Share with broader humanitarian community
**Project Phases**

**PHASE 1**
- Define & develop framework – H-BSC
- Identify initial KPIs for testing

**PHASE 2**
- Test initial KPIs with pilot organizations
- Refine initial KPIs
- Build out balance of KPIs for framework

**PHASE 3**
- Testing of full set of H-BSC KPIs
- Develop toolbox for implementation
- Establish platform for long-term housing
- Share with broader humanitarian community

---

**Sector-Wide KPI Program**

WE ARE HERE.
Sustainability

• Beyond the Working Group
  – Working Group provided initial direction and tested framework
  – Long-term ownership by humanitarian sector

• Platform
  – Common framework resulting in comparable data
  – Established system and tools for submitting and compiling
  – System for anonymizing data
  – Data analysis support by Vrije University
  – Provision of standard reports and access to analysis for participating organizations
Contacts

Mitsuko Mizushima
mitsuko.mizushima@yahoo.com

Nathalie Abramo
nathaliebutcher@yahoo.com
COFFEE BREAK

Session will re-start at 15:30
WORKING GROUPS – PREPAREDNESS AND BUDGET STRATEGY
PREPAREDNESS
PREPAREDNESS
New GLC Strategy Pillar 2016-2018
Commonly Identified by Log Cluster Partners

1 PILLAR

with

2 OBJECTIVES

&

6 ACHIEVABLES

1) Identify and prioritize 6 disaster prone countries (Myanmar/Indonesia/Madagascar/Nigeria/Bangladesh/Haiti)
2) Map capacities and gaps with local stakeholders using new and existing tools/protocols
3) Develop scenarios based on risk analysis
4) Assess disaster impacts on infrastructure and capacities
5) Support governments and stakeholders to address gaps
6) Identify organisations and local actors best placed to address gaps
GOAL 2: Map capacities & gaps with local stakeholders using existing and new tools

TOOLS BEING DEV TO SUPPORT CAPACITY MAPPING ACTIVITIES
Preparedness

Preparedness saves lives and money during disasters and crises. Adequate preparedness by national actors can also significantly improve first response at the local and national level, and reduce the need for international mobilisation. This goal focuses on supporting the national logistics capacity of identified disaster prone countries.

Strategy Goal 1 - Strengthen Logistics Preparedness of National Actors

GLC PREPAREDNESS STRATEGY 2016-2018

Guidance Flow

Global Contacts

Preparedness Officer
Faheem Arain
faheem.arain@wfp.org

Key Documents

Preparedness Strategy Note
Report Download
Preparedness Concept Note
Report Download
An open portal for open collaboration
Embedded in Logistics Cluster Preparedness Webpage
Real-Time User Driven Input Direct from Field to Platform

Provides:

- Preparedness Initiative visibility
- Partner Driven Information Gathering and Sharing
- Scenario Building and Response Planning
- Single or combined users

http://lrt-training.logcluster.org/preparedness
THE BEST CURRENT EXAMPLE OF LOGISTICS CLUSTER PREPAREDNESS
Inter-Agency Bangladesh Preparedness Meetings
In
DHAKA

Over 16 Partners
Earthquake & Cyclone Scenarios

Gaps & Needs

Access, Entry Routes

Corridors, Hubs

Logs capacities

Common Service Request Planning from the Logistics Cluster
PREPAREDNESS
Bangladesh National Prep with GoB

Earthquake & Cyclone Scenarios

Funded through WFP
EPR TRUST FUND
Germany
Bangladesh Proposed Activities for which support is needed:

1) Humanitarian Staging Area: Functional design, engineering, construction, training and tech support

2) Info and Data Preparedness: Rapid Log Assessment Tools/Ops Dashboard/Stockpile Mapping

3) Cap Dev & Coordination: Training & Sims
WHAT MAKES IT WORK?
WHAT IS LACKING TO MAKE IT BETTER?
NEXT STEPS

- IM SUPPORT
- TOOLS SUPPORT (WEBPAGE/PLATFORM)
- SHARED PREPAREDNESS PLAN (commonly address identified gaps)
- FINALISED CONOPS
- RESPONSE PLAN & AGREED ARRANGEMENTS
- DRILLS AND SIMS (LRT with Gov)
- ADVOCACY FOR IDENTIFIED GAPS & REGIONAL CROSS BORDER PREPAREDNESS (Bangladesh / Myanmar etc.)
WHAT IS CLEAR FROM YESTERDAY:

WE NEED TO KEEP THE WORKING GROUP SUPPORT AND MOMENTUM

REPLICATE THE SUPPORT, STRUCTURE AND MOMENTUM AT THE FIELD LEVEL

WE NEED ONE WORKING MODEL IN ONE COUNTRY........
Welcome to Haiti.

In 2017
HURRICANE STEPHEN

IMAGINE

6 MONTHS FROM NOW

WITH NO LOGISTICS CLUSTER PREPAREDNESS MEETINGS IN HAITI
WITH NO CYCLONE/EQ SCENARIO
WITH NO RESPONSE STRATEGY
WITH NO SIMULATIONS
(INCL. GOV/CUSTOMS/NAT SOCIETIES/COM/PS/CBO)
“Until money and other resources come into Haiti in a way that builds up local institutions, including the government, and gives Haitians control over their own lives, no number of emergency aid deliveries or one-off development projects are going to leave Haitians in a position to weather future disasters of any kind.”

Katz, 2016
http://www.irinnews.org/opinion/2016/10/19/why-haiti-wasn%E2%80%99t-ready-hurricane-qa-jonathan-katz
WHAT GOVERNMENT CAPACITY BUILDING & LOCALISATION CAN WE REALISTICALLY DO IN HAITI?

WHAT PREPAREDNESS CAN WE REALISTICALLY DO IN HAITI?
HAITI – Special Operation

- Logistics Sector Working Group (already established)
- Staff, IM & tools support to maintain the momentum
- Scenario Planning
- Response Strategy
- On ground Inter-Agency Drills
BUDGET

- GLOBAL LEVEL (Covered by the WFP/LC)

- FIELD LEVEL (One Preparedness Officer per Country – Cluster partners)

- INITIATIVES TO COVER SUPPLY CHAIN GAPS (Fundraising from the country level)
THOUGHTS?
WHAT CAN YOU AND YOUR ORGANISATION OFFER?
PARKING LOT DISCUSSIONS
DINNER
Kindly hosted by

KUEHNE + NAGEL

EMERGENCY & RELIEF LOGISTICS

Time: 19:30
Location: Leopold Hotel Brussels EU
Rue du Luxembourg 35, 1050 Bruxelles
END OF DAY TWO