Preparedness Survey Results & Analysis

GLC PREPAREDNESS

Results of the 6 Country Survey

Introduction

As part of initial Global Logistics Cluster (GLC) Preparedness activities, it was requested by partner organisations to identify disaster-prone/at-risk countries and prioritise six countries most urgently needing to improve logistics response capacity. After a selection of 30 was derived from an exhaustive list of multiple indices, a survey was held to gain Logistics Cluster partners’ opinions and promote ongoing partner preparedness activities with GLC strategy alignment.

The task at hand of narrowing down options to just six countries, with the mass of mounting needs and limited resources in-hand, has an inherent complexity. We therefore would like to thank all respondents of the survey for taking the time to be a vital part and key enabler of the Logistics Cluster. Your opinion and information has increased the knowledge pool and narrowed down information gaps as we set forth towards defining the direction of the strategy. Therefore this note serves the purpose of explaining the results of the recent survey and providing some next step actions.

Survey Responses

The survey ran over a 4 week period. Initial response rates were low, however increased towards the deadline with some responses received post-deadline but fully included in results. The final overall response figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid for Purpose</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group Positive</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/Local Collaboration Positive</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses received were 50, with only 30 responses representing adequate qualitative and quantitative information that were valid for the purpose of the survey.

Overall Response Split:

Please specify the type of organisation in which you work:

- Non Governments (Organisation)
- International or National
- United Nations Agency
- Government/ donor
- Private company
- University/ Research
- Independen
Respondents Profile:
Respondent’s profiles ranged from a wide group of supply chain and logistics professionals including responses from programmatic cluster partners with respondent’s locations mainly representing the global level thus representing the generalizability and validity of response results for the Logistics Cluster. An overview list of profiles is below:

- Global/International Logistics Manager
- Logistics Officer
- Supply Chain Manager
- Head of Logistics
- Inter-Agency SRH Manager
- Disaster Response Manager
- Associate Director – Logistics
- Procurement Specialist
- CCCM Officer
- Policy Officer
- Emergency Relief Coordinator/Project Manager
- Humanitarian Specialist
- Inventory Associate
- Emergency Desk Officer
- Global WASH Cluster
- Logistics Advisor
- Shelter/Settlements Officer
- Emergency Health Logistics
- Head of Logistics (Asia)
- Managing Director
- Field Coordination Support – ETC
- Deputy Director – Supply Chain
- Senior Emergency Supply Manager
- Operations Team Lead

6 Countries – Results Data Analysis
The countries provided in the survey, according to a priority level, represented a statistical task to narrow down due to the wide spread of responses ie. 30 (respondents) X 6 (countries) X 6 (priority levels) including correction for certain responses that only provided 1/2/3/4 or 5 countries and double counts (duplicated choices). The initial analysis technique was therefore to assign weights to each country as a single country could be mentioned by multiple responders at multiple priorities (ie. sequence).
For the purpose of analysis simplification, it was therefore decided to remove the priority level with no loss of data value. This allowed us to utilise a basic total count formula to see which countries were mentioned (voted) the most. The **Total Count List** below shows the results of this technique:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Num of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counts above then required further filtering against the followings factors:
- Countries with a current and active Logistics Cluster Operation
- Countries with Logistics Cluster lead agency presence
- Countries without Logistics Cluster lead agency presence (for automatic choice inclusion of up to 50%)
- Countries without current Logistics Cluster operations
- Countries against current LCA update status and Logistics Cluster historic database information
- Countries known to have other Global Cluster (programmatic/service) preparedness focus
- Countries against existing WFP and Logistics Cluster Preparedness focus (100% in Asia/Pacific region)
- Countries representing a regional spread
- Countries representing a variety of known hazards (responder comment driven)
- Countries representing known partner operations (minor operational outlay input from responders)
- Countries representing a variety of context specific parameters (eg. open/closed governments/access)
- A final desk review by GLC staff and management taking the above into account
The cross-analysed list is therefore (in no particular order):

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

The survey data at this point, as a means of input to the exercise provides no more value towards choice selection.

Taking all possible factors into account, the selection above, reflects the following reasoning:

- Natural disaster focus – all are high-risk (recurrent, expected high-impact and high population density, potential to require external support)
- Project and Logistics Cluster flexibility for quick detection of immediate initiatives and rapid responsiveness potential
- Hindsight leads to foresight – previous disaster experience allows for informed scenario building
- Cross-country knowledge transfer – Disaster management experience of similar responses would be transferable across the list and hold potential to reveal new insights, linkages and opportunities
- Existing structure and humanitarian set-ups – Preparedness, especially at the local level requires structure to build upon – established relationships with government response capacity exist
- Location neutrality – Whole of society approach (inclusion of all partners) is more possible as political and other considered exclusions are minimised
- Other known initiatives and existing Preparedness project alignment – allows for clearer Logistics Cluster project parameters and positions where projects can add value
- Country position regarding development status and where projects could link response to development – positions on status of government frameworks for international assistance
- Project localisation potential (local market/private sector/National Cluster’s)

Countries mentioned that were not part of the initial list of 30:

- Burundi
- Libya
- CAR
- Lebanon
- Regional (Southern Africa/Middle East)
- Tehran
- Iraq
- Mexico City

Comments related to choice selection:
As the comments were numerous in relation to individual choices, direct analysis into a concise result does not yield meaningful information but valid comments were used to inform the 6 choice reasoning above
Comments related to Collaboration:

Is your organisation willing and able to participate with Logistics Cluster partners as part of a collaborative strategy and preparedness action plan to address logistics gaps in priority countries?

![Graph showing 88% positive response]  
Answered: 25 Skipped: 25

Although 50% of respondents skipped this question, 88% who answered, answered positive towards closer collaboration to address national/local level Preparedness.

Comments related to Working Group participation:

Is your organisation willing to partake in a Global Logistics Cluster Preparedness Working Group?
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Although 50% of respondents skipped this question, 80% who answered, answered positive towards inclusion in a Preparedness Working Group.

Next Steps

We now wish to gain Cluster organisations’ endorsement for the presented list, before proceeding with next steps in the coming weeks.

Please feel free to provide your feedback to Faheem.araie@wfp.org soonest.

Thank you once again for your valuable and necessary collaboration.