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**Introduction**

Being a landlocked country of 9.1 million people, Tajikistan faces continuous food-security challenges with the highest malnutrition rate in Central Asia, despite having had lowering rate over the past decade. The country is also the most vulnerable to climate shocks in the region [Climate Change Knowledge Portal, WB\(^1\)] due to soil erosion, loss of biodiversity, melting glaciers and exposure to many extreme weather events such as floods, droughts, avalanches, and landslides that regularly destroy land, crops, infrastructures, and livelihoods. These events often result in displacement of already vulnerable population to lose their livelihoods, food stocks and agricultural production.

The Logistics Cluster, established by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), serves as a partnership mechanism building on a solid network of partners promoting and enabling joint humanitarian logistics preparedness and response. Being identified as one of the pilot countries for the Global Logistics Cluster (GLC) Field Based Preparedness Project (FBPP), Tajikistan has been taking on this initiative since April 2021. The FBPP aims to support national actors in strengthening their capacities in humanitarian logistics preparedness.

As a result, the National Logistics Preparedness Working Group (NLPWG) has been established within the broader REACT partnership in June 2021. The NLPWG consists of representatives of government agencies, United Nations organisations, international non-governmental organisations, and the private sector.

The objective of the NLPWG is to bring together humanitarian, development, government, and private sector actors engaged with supply chain and operational responsibilities to jointly identify and mitigate humanitarian supply chain and logistics gaps and risks in Tajikistan. The working group meets on a quarterly basis to discuss common supply chain issues and prepare for joint humanitarian logistics response.

Led by the Committee of Emergency Situations and Civil Defense (CoES), the NLPWG has jointly validated its Capacity Outcome statement as follows:

*Enhanced capacity of NDMO (CoES) to effectively implement information management strategy and improve the coordination mechanism through strengthening the capacity of CoES in developing information and coordination systems. While ensuring that all relevant logistics information is collected and disseminated in a timely manner to the broader humanitarian community so that the responses can be delivered effectively and efficiently*.

**Background**

As a preparedness measure, many humanitarian actors in country support affected populations with pre-positioned emergency supplies and coordination mechanism at the national and local levels. It is worth to mention that during recent disaster in Khatlon region there were shortcomings in some locations due to a lack of coordination mechanism between the different humanitarian actors, resulting in weak coordination, duplication of efforts, and unforeseen transportation costs, which caused delays in the humanitarian supply chain and logistics response to natural disasters. Recent studies have indicated that Logistics and Supply Chain constitutes more than 70% of the response cost.

Hence, to strengthen Supply Chain and Logistics Preparedness system a National Logistics Preparedness Working Group (NLPWG) in Tajikistan was established in June 2021 to bring together

\(^1\) [https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/](https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/)
humanitarian, development, government, and private sector actors engaged with supply chain and operational responsibilities to jointly identify and mitigate Humanitarian Supply Chain and Logistics preparedness gaps and risks in Tajikistan. The group is led by the Committee of Emergency Situations and Civil Defense under the Government of Tajikistan (CoES) and is a technical team under REACT.

CoES, being the leading government agency for emergency management, with the support of the GLC FBPP and the World Food Programme, carried out on 14 December 2021 a Capacity Needs Mapping exercise (CNM) with the NLPWG members and other stakeholders active in emergency logistics operations in the country. The overall objective of the CNM exercise was to assess capacity of the country’s current Humanitarian Supply Chain & Logistics (HSC&L) system and establish a shared and mutually agreed-upon baseline understanding of the system itself, not the capacity of individual stakeholder. Furthermore, the CNM process identified those areas that need to be addressed for HSC&L Preparedness and guide stakeholder priorities for investment going forward.

**Methodology and ranking**

During the CNM process, participants assessed current capacity level, identified gaps, and at the same time proposed actions to overcome the challenges through structured group discussion along the five critical pathways that are required for sustainable capacity transformation.

The Five Pathways included guiding questions on existing supportive laws, policies, strategies, and procedures (enabling environment), if organisations are well functioning (organizational domain), if organisation has skilled people (individual domain) and if they can effectively plan, implement, and review their efforts to deliver intended products and services to their target groups. In other words, the following capacity pathways were discussed:

Pathway 1. The HSC&L policy and regulatory environment,
Pathway 2. CoES Institutional effectiveness and accountability
Pathway 3. Strategic Planning and Financing for HSC&L
Pathway 4. The National HSC&L Preparedness Plan
Pathway 5. Engagement and Participation of other actors in HSC&L

The levels of capacity were ranked in accordance with 4 categories: latent, emergent, moderate, and self-sufficient.

**Latent** capacity is about lack of capacities or non-existence of capacities due to financial constraints, heavy reliance on external assistance, and low levels of sustainability and civil society/private sector participation.

**Emergent** capacity means that the development of some critical elements in question or political will for the capacity are being developed but facing multiple limitations. This capacity exists but with limited national budget allocation, largely dependent on external funding.

---

2 REACT (Rapid Emergency Assessment and Coordination Team) – a partnership on disaster management in Tajikistan is the coordinating structure for international disaster response in Tajikistan. Chairmanship of REACT transferred to the Committee of Emergency Situations and Civil Defense (CoES), Government of Tajikistan and UN OCHA acting as the REACT Secretariat.
Moderate capacity sees the capacity development with strong political will to support HSC&L enhancement and progress, opportunity for increasing national allocation of resources, and average technical capacities.

Self-sufficient capacity sees well-established and functional elements. It also can be indicated through a well-established and functional HSC&L response capacity, strong governance capacity, and core capabilities rooted in a well-functioning national institutional setting.

CNM process and participants

The CNM process involved a detailed set of guiding questions to discuss and ensure a holistic approach to assessing the capacity of HSC&L system. CNM results are expressed through the collection of existing qualitative and quantitative evidence provided by stakeholders, who collectively classified current capacities along a spectrum of values. In total 30 participants out of NLPWG members and private sector representatives were involved in the CNM discussion. The participants were introduced with the capacity needs mapping process and received the necessary information about the objectives of the workshop.

All participants were split into three working groups to discuss HSC&L capacities, existing gaps, and recommended actions to address the gaps. Three facilitators were sensitized with the CNM facilitation process before the workshop.

Main CNM exercise findings:

During the CNM process, participants assessed current capacity level, identified gaps, and at the same time proposed actions to overcome the challenges through structured group discussion along the capacity pathways that are required for sustainability. The main findings of the pathways with rating are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Pathway</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emergent</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Self-sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The HSC&amp;L policy and regulatory environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 HSC&amp;L Sectoral instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Multi-sectoral integration of HSC&amp;L preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 International and regional HSC&amp;L partnerships</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CoES Institutional effectiveness and accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 CoES institutional mandate and recognition in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 HSC&amp;L coordination mechanisms and accountability in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 HSC&L information dissemination mechanisms in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

2.4 HSC&L process optimisation in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

2.5 Evidence-based approach for HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

2.6 HSC&L assets, platforms and infrastructure in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

2.7 National/local HSC&L partnerships as relevant to HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

3. Strategic planning and financing for HSC&L preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability  

3.1 Value proposition of HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

3.2 Strategic planning for HSC&L Preparedness as relevant in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

3.3 Sustainable financing for HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

3.4 Financial management systems.  

4. The national HSC&L Preparedness plan  

4.1 Design of the HSC&L Preparedness Plan  

4.2 HSC&L Preparedness Plan implementation in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

4.3 Stakeholder HSC&L implementation capacity in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

4.4 Accountability and Grievance management as relevant to HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

5. Engagement of other actors in HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability  

5.1 In HSC&L Preparedness Plan design  

5.2 In HSC&L Preparedness Plan implementation in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.  

5.3 Research, development, and innovation in HSC&L  

5.4 Sustainable human capital in HSC&L  

**Detailed findings in the context of each pathway:**
### Pathway 1. HSC&L policy and regulatory environment

**Existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.**

#### Existing capacities
There are policy and regulatory environment touching upon HSC&L indirectly which are as follows:
- Regulations Government that stipulates responsibilities of CoES (# 547 as of 29 November 2017)
- Structure and functioning of the Unified State System of the Republic of Tajikistan for the Prevention and Elimination of Emergency Situations (№ 833 as of 30 December 2014)
- Law about Civil defense (# 6 as of 28 February 2004)
- Law about protection of population and territories from natural and man-made emergencies (# 558 as of 8 July 2004)
- Law about the State material reserve (# 246 as of 15 December 2006)
- Law about emergency services, emergency structures and legal status of rescuers (# 83 as of 1 March 2005)

The following regulatory instruments directly stipulate HSC&L issue:
- Regulation signed by President the Rules of creation and use of reserves of material resources for liquidation of emergency situations of natural and man-made character (# 778 as of 29 December 2006)
- Regulation on the management of humanitarian and technical assistance in Tajikistan (in 2000 changes/additions done in 2009)

#### Gaps/challenges
- The above-mentioned regulatory instruments address relevance to infrastructure and policy, and all links in the logistics chain: road, rail, maritime transport, and aviation, logistics centres, customs with a little indication where these may vary in times of crisis versus times of peace and stability.
- The relationship with relevant social sector ministries and the private sector is somehow acknowledged in the regulatory policy, however it does not clearly outline financial resource mobilization (roughly said from the local budget).
- CoES awareness on accountabilities and sectorial responsibilities of HSC&L chain is low
- The grievance management and M&E mechanisms is clearly stipulated in the regulatory instruments in times of crisis versus times of peace and stability, however in practice it is not applied, and transparency is lacking in the times of crises.
- Separation of powers of the relevant structures, responsibility for non-compliance is not specified in regulatory legal acts

#### What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
- Support CoES to address HSC&L preparedness in the national emergency preparedness and response policy/regulatory instrument.
- Need for capacity strengthening in digitalisation discourse, development, and innovation in the HSC&L preparedness field as a political will exists.
- The HSC&L stakeholders should be aware of all available regulatory instruments while M&E, grievance mechanism and responsibilities regarding accountability should be systemized. Thus, a capacity strengthening program in information sharing and coordination mechanisms need to be developed.
- Support CoES in revision of existing regulatory instruments to clearly outline definitions and targets for HSC&L preparedness
Support CoES to anchor National HSC&L Preparedness Plan

- Introduce amendments and additions to the normative acts on administrative measures for failure to fulfill their tasks
- Support CoES in organisation of the on-the-job trainings for other line ministries/committees and agencies to fulfil their goals and objectives not only during crises but at the times of peace and stability.
- Provide assistance in updating the regulatory legal act taking into account the international practices

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

The Law about protection of population and territories from natural and man-made emergencies (# 558 as of 8 July 2004) and the Law about civil defence are in force now. Some points of the given laws are overlapping each other therefore, the commission is settled at CoES with the support of ADB to merge and elaborate one law that will cover protection of population at crises and ensure the civil defence.

1.2 Multi-sectoral integration of HSC&L preparedness

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

Existing capacities

- In the existing sector specific policies, the tasks and responsibilities are clearly written how to react at emergencies and at the times of peace and stability
- The regulatory instruments indicate complementarities and support to emergency response and HSC&L preparedness, in relation to times of crisis. The sector players are active during crises, while the preparations are done at times of peace and stability.
- The institutions are accountable to the Government in relation to times of crisis, while no mention is made of complementarities in times of peace and stability.
- The regulatory acts specify the functions of intersectoral integration and agencies

Gaps/challenges

- Multi-sectoral integration and coordination is missing in relation with HSC&L preparedness
- CoES has in his stock pre-positioning items but it is not enough for emergency respond
- There is no responsibility of other government structures for HSC&L preparedness
- Coordination mechanism of other multisectoral structures work is missing
- There is accountability to fulfil assigned tasks of the inter-agency structures but only at crises, but there is no preparedness in times of peace and stability
- Coordination mechanism between development partners does not always work

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Increased coordination across responsible government entities to ensure all the required processes are transparent and fulfilled both in times of crises and peace/stability.
- Support CoES in integrating HSC&L preparedness objectives and considerations into other sector-specific legislation to strengthen policy coherence
- Assistance to make amendments to the administrative code
- Training of representatives of intersectoral structures, also at local level
1.3 International and regional HSC&L partnerships

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

**Existing capacity**
- There is frequent and continuous engagement in – or partnership with – relevant international and/or regional players and fora. The government holds all forums and conferences at the international and regional levels are held at a high level.
- Agreements, Memorandum of Understandings with international agencies are being signed on national level for cooperation at emergencies.
- There is a political will to strengthen the partnership to enter the international arena through capacity building in the coordination mechanism

**Gaps/challenge**
- The partnership with international agencies exists, however national HSCH&L preparedness plans are not discussed as it not existing.
- Stakeholders have not engaged in any instances of South-South Cooperation, they simply do not know about existence of the cooperation.
- At the level of specialists and those who perform the task of South-South at the proper level is not applied
- Specialists are not sufficiently informed about South-South cooperation
- Insufficient knowledge about the work of international and regional partners
- Key specialists are lack of knowledge of relevant foreign terms
- Lack of coordination mechanism and information exchange platforms

**What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?**
- Support CoES in mapping relevant international and regional events including HSCH&L topics and disseminate through appropriate platforms to a wide range of institutional players, private sector, civil society, and external actors who may be interested.
- Organise a working meeting with CoES to introduce South-South Cooperation and in cooperation with institutional leads assist in promotion of Tajikistan engagement.
- Enhance South-South Cooperation for and from Tajikistan in regard with supply chain areas and fora/events to advertise best practices and brainstorm around common HSC&L preparedness issues.
- Organize an introductory workshop on the goals and objectives of South-South cooperation,
- Share information between CoES staff on international and regional partnerships,
- Develop fact sheets for all stakeholders on international and regional partnerships
- Organize exchange visits with other countries to strengthen HSC& L partnerships
- Organize professional development courses
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

REACT, WFP

Overall participants agreed that local actors are facilitated with relevant policy and regulatory environment in delivering timely and appropriate emergency response services. While, there is policy and regulatory environment that supports HSC&L preparedness in country, the entire regulations cover only for and during the emergency situations, there are no mentions of national humanitarian supply chain and logistics preparedness responsibilities in times of peace and stability. The overall rating of Pathway 1 was 58%. The capacity level of this pathway was largely scored as moderate because there are relevant sectoral policies and legislative framework that clearly outlines institutional responsibilities for national humanitarian supply chain and logistics.

**Pathway 2. Institutional effectiveness and accountability**

**2.1 CoES institutional mandate and recognition in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacities, main gaps and challenges.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing capacities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ The existing country legal and regulatory frameworks are supportive as CoES mandate and recognition in times of crisis and times of peace and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ CoES is recognised by all key players because the institution mandated to lead on implementing the national preparedness agenda at the times of crisis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ CoES conducts regular simulations in times of peace and stability to be able to respond in times of crisis good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaps/challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ There is no clear guidance on how the HSC&amp;L should be coordinated in peacetime, this cannot be done (e.g., whose responsibility is it?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Coordination between key players is missing, especially in times of peace and stability (e.g., no access to the stock prepositioning of the Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Limited resources are allocated to national HSC&amp;L preparedness, and it is controlled by various entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ There is no regular monitoring and evaluation by CoES at local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ The accountability for non-compliance of set regulations regarding HSC&amp;L by other involved actors are missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ The HSC&amp;L sphere is not developed in the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Financial resources are not set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?**

- There are policies in place which are supportive of the stakeholder’s execution of the mandates
- Reinforce the coordination and information sharing mechanism (support in establishing information sharing platform) whereas commitment of state and non-state agencies should be clearly highlighted
CoES accountability should be not only about crises, but more stress should also be done for the information/reporting at the times of peace and stability to reinforce recognition at both times.
- Support CoES in advocacy to strengthen its recognition of the institutional mandate with the purpose of HSC&L preparedness agenda promotion
- And perhaps focus on articulating an integrated SC&L Strategy that holds in times of peace and stability – CoES maybe can spearhead and co-lead this with another institutional stakeholder to be identified (just a thought, to be explored) – bottom line is there needs to be an explicit national SC&L Plan (of which maybe the HSC&L Preparedness plan can be a sub-component)
- Assist in mobilizing development partners and other stakeholders to use the material and technical base of the CoES (transport, etc.)
- Allocation of additional budget line in the state budget to strengthen HSC&L preparedness in the country
- Strengthen the capacity of the CoES in conducting monitoring and evaluation of the work of other departments HSC&L preparedness.
- Come up with a proposal to the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Tajikistan on establishing responsibility for non-compliance and not following the legislation established for emergencies
- Strengthen CoES capacity to conduct dialogues with key players
- Support CoES in initiation for the creation of a single ministry, which will include the Committee for Emergency Situations, the fire service, material assistance agencies in the Republic of Tajikistan and ambulance (resuscitation)

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?
No information
Local government authorities

### 2.2 HSC&L coordination mechanisms and accountability in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

#### Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

**Existing capacities**
- CoEs mobilises adequate response actions of key players at times of crises,
- Regulatory instrument exists in putting in place and secure emergency funds, but due to lack of funds response comes with delays in most cases not enough
- Staff to execute HSC&L coordination are adequate within CoES
- Key players are motivated in HSC&L coordination mechanism
- Networks/partnerships exists (MoUs, Agreements are signed) but it mostly managed by the partners

**Gaps/challenges**
- Coordination mechanism and accountability are actively working during crises but not in the times of peace and stability.
- No coordination mechanism and accountability efforts at regions, district level due to limited knowledge on HSC&L which affect monitoring, accountability, and reporting
- Formal coordination mechanism that promotes HSC&L is missing or unsystematic
- Some sectors/key players show lack commitment during implementation
- Stakeholder accountability lines at sub-national level are not clearly defined, therefore transparency is lacking
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
- Strengthen capacity of CoES responsible units in HSC&L (at national, sub-national and local levels) and increase commitment to be accountable
- Support partner – key players incorporation into the coordination structures and strengthen it at the local levels
- Assist in establishing coordination mechanism as well as creation of the coordination platform which will be used on regular base for the meetings/discussions
- Strengthen the capacity of Focal persons (at least three) to lead the coordination and accountability structures in line with their roles and ensure stakeholder regular participation and provision of relevant information (strengthen NLPWG capacity to oversee and coordinate implementation of HSC&L preparedness initiatives/plan)

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?
WFP and CoES
REACT and National Logistics Preparedness Working Group

2.3 HSC&L information dissemination mechanisms in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

Existing capacities
- Technical staff and willingness of establishing information sharing mechanisms in times of crises and in times of peace and stability
- Information/communication unit with technical staff
- Grievance management exists but not rolled out to sub-national and local levels
- Publishing an annual report on occurred disasters (in February) in three languages
- There is a National Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction for 2019-2030 adopted by the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan dated as of December 28, 2018
- The program for the development of CoES for 2018-2022 was approved by the Decree of the Republic of Tajikistan dated as of May 30
- There is a single number 112 in emergency situations and at the same time a rescuer on duty around the clock to provide assistance in an accident or emergency (24 hours)

Gaps/challenges
- Lack of information sharing platform and coordination mechanism
- Key players are not aware that the information sharing mechanism should be active not only in times of crises but also at the times of peace and stability
- Poor internet connectivity to operationalize its tasks at national and local levels (not all divisions have internet connections).
- The implementers at local levels require access, a decentralized system and training to be able to utilize the existing systems currently operating at the national level.
- There is no plan for the HSC&L preparedness information dissemination mechanism
- Financial resources for the information dissemination mechanism are not separately allocated
- Information during a crisis reaches faster than in a peaceful and stable time
- A single number 112 in the regions does not work at the proper level (not everyone knows about the existence of a hot line 112)
What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Support CoES in elaboration of the concept note to establish information sharing platform
- Support in reinforcement of the platform in which CoES will meet for information sharing
- Financial support to establish information sharing platform and improve capacities of CoES in its maintenance.
- Provide on-the-job trainings with technical input (computers, access to internet connection, communication, and advocacy)
- Strengthening the capacity of local CoES to disseminate information
- Creation of an online information portal for the exchange of information between all interested parties
- Resume SMS alerts from mobile campaigns in case of emergency (weather forecast, possible emergencies, warnings)
- Turn to mobile campaigns to improve the unified 112 number in the regions

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

REACT

2.4 HSC&L process optimisation in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

**Existing capacities**
- The data/information is collected and digitalised for reporting on regular base in both times, but it is not centralised,
- Overall data quality control and compliance mechanisms are done within CoES systems, but it is not formally endorsed.
- Technical staff and willingness to establish mechanisms for sharing information during crises and in times of peace and stability
- Existence of department of information/communication with technical staff
- Complaints management exists but is not widespread at subnational and local levels
- There is a CMC (Crisis Management Center) at CoES

**Gaps/challenges**
- No digitalization action plan as well as lack of strategy on digitalisation, digital MIS doesn’t exist
- No data on institutional accountability which supports reporting
- The grievance mechanism is not digitalised at all
- Lack of information sharing platform/mechanism
- Key players do not know that the information exchange should be active not only during a crisis, but also in a peaceful and stable times
- Poor internet connection for the implementation of tasks at the national and local levels (not all CoES units have internet).
- Local implementers need access, decentralized system, and training to be able to use existing systems at national level.

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Support in elaboration of digital strategy and endorsement of its action plan
- As the long-term intervention support with trainings and technical support for digitalisation (to be able to design and develop SC&L information system management) and rolling out
- Procurement of equipment and training to use it
- Assist in the digitization of information dissemination
- Assist the CoES in developing a concept for creating an information exchange platform
- Support to strengthen the focal point where CoES will meet to exchange information
- Financial support to create a platform for information exchange and increase the capacity of the CoES to be able to provide its support with SC&L.
- Conducting on-the-job training with technical support (computers, internet access, communication, and advocacy)
- Equipping with individual special uniforms and means of communication, as well as for the centre of information management
- Strengthening the capacity of local emergency personnel to carry out damage assessment

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

No information

### 2.5 Evidence-based approach for HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

**Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing capacities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ M&amp;E is conducted and is partially digitalised (for overall actions), however operates at the national level, the data of which monitored in the times of crises only. Rapid assessment exists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Reports are being sent to national level without emphasizing to HSC&amp;L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Disaster affected zones are assessed by the state commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps/challenges</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ M&amp;E calendar and plan are missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A comprehensive situation analysis relating to specific and relevant issues for national HSC&amp;L preparedness has yet to be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ National HSC&amp;L preparedness evaluations are not undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ No M&amp;E systems are in place for national HSC&amp;L preparedness (or they may exist but are very weak)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Some people living in the danger zone come back to the households in the danger zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?**

- Provide support to CoES in designing comprehensive logistics preparedness capacity baseline survey for national HSC&L preparedness functions and capacities
- Provide support in strengthening M&E system (in elaboration of M&E calendars and plans) for the HSC&L preparedness function as well as SC&L during peace and stability times.
- Trainings of the responsible reporting officers in improved M&E strategy for HSC&L and support in digitalisation of collected data to be able to be accountable and transparent upon preparation strengthening M&E process of CoEs
- Assist in creation of data base
- Provide support in conducting regular trails/trainings
- Provide support in evacuation of affected people if needed and in information dissemination
- Assistance in elaboration reports on HSC&L preparedness measures
2.6 HSC&L assets, platforms, and infrastructure in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

**Existing capacities**
- The infrastructure and assets (vehicle, hubs, warehouses, office equipment and furniture) are available that are used in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability which is operational at national level
- Responsible personnel and the unit for transport and technical maintenance are existing

**Gaps/challenges**
- Existing assets and infrastructure capacities do not guarantee an effective and efficient national HSC&L preparedness functions due to poor conditions. It is not adequate as the local level staff does not have financial resources to fill their vehicle, however there is budget allocated at national level due to funds disbursement. Additionally, no maintenance workshop (the place to repair vehicles) and lack of fund for fuel for existing vehicles.
- The structures at the district level designated to ensure coordination and accountability are not fully functional also because the national level does not share accountability information with the district.
- End-users are not equipped with the skills needed to maintain, manage, or benefit from essential assets
- CoES relies on international agencies to reinforce HSC&L assets and infrastructure

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
- Financial support (budget provision at national level) in vehicle maintenance, provision of fuel, GPS devices in their vehicles, construction of 5 warehouses in Sughd and Kulob areas with storage assets (food and NFI)
- Provide trainings to improve skills of responsible personnel to maintain assets – a more detailed needs assessment may be required (e.g., what assets specifically? Fleet management/maintenance is very different from hub/warehouse management, etc.)
- Apply new asset management technologies, tools, and practices to put functions at all levels (national, sub-national and local levels), for instance information sharing platform
- Assist in the creation of a service station at the CoES (technical support, forces and means)
- Financing in the provision of office space for the district CoES
- Support in digitalization (online) of the entire CoES system
- Provision of assistance (funding) for the establishment and improvement of early warning systems in mountainous areas, uniforms for regional CoES (rescuers)
- Assist in the development of an evacuation plan
- Assisting in the construction and equipping of warehouses for first aid in case of emergency

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

No information
2.7 National/local HSC&L partnerships as relevant to HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing capacities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Operational partnership to socialise national HSC&amp;L preparedness have been formalised, for instance international agencies handed over equipment and furniture to the national CoES (Cooperation and Emergency Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ There are partners to support CoES at crises and in times of peace and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Recently established NLPWG out of key stakeholders of humanitarian supply chain and logistics (platform for dialogue between state and non-state agencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaps/challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Weak civil society engagement. Private sector is pushed to support by the high-level officials during crises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Majority of partners involve their resources at the times of crises only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ District level CoES staff are less aware of local HSC&amp;L partnerships, thus information sharing system does not exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reinforce information sharing platform to be able to use for dialogues, collection of needed data and dissemination (NLPWG regular meetings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reinforce capacities of CoES in the sense of ownership (to be responsible for maintenance of information sharing platform – soft/hard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve capacities of CoES in local HSC&amp;L partnerships to the preparedness in times of crises and in times of peace and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creation of a database on existing memorandums, agreements with the CoES and development partners at the national and district levels), in the absence, facilitate to sign new agreement if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strengthening the capacity of local government agencies to attract partners in HSC&amp;L preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP, REACT, Global partners, Habitat, Red Crescent Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the given pathway participants agreed that CoES is recognized as the institution mandated to lead the national humanitarian supply chain and logistics preparedness agenda both in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability. Although CoES takes lead in overseeing and coordinating the delivery with timely and appropriate support, coordination among key players is missing, especially in times of peace and stability. Some shortcomings of institutional effectiveness have been identified for improvement such as key players lack access to the Government’s prepositioned stock, lack of proper monitoring system and grievance mechanism at sub-national level, as well as limited resources being allocated to national HSC&L preparedness, lack of coordination and no existing information management platform to discuss logistics preparedness etc. However, there is a political will and readiness of CoES to improve for the better. The overall scoring of Pathway 2 is 33% and the rating ranges between latent and emergent.

**Pathway 3 - Strategic planning and financing for HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability**
3.1 Value proposition of HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing capacities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Understanding of the importance of national HSC&amp;L preparedness agenda and willingness/readiness to cooperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ The units/divisions exit with experts to support the national HSC&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ The state always has a standard potential. In peacetime, the CoES always makes decisions based on certain emergencies and security situations. As for the period of the crisis, there are certain gaps here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps/challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Lack of solid evidence-based analysis of the context regarding the value proposition and importance of investing in HSC&amp;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Weak support of national HSC&amp;L preparedness at central level, sometimes support is ensured but only in times of crises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ HSC&amp;L preparedness is not communicated at downstream to decentralised structures and local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ There is no evidence-based analysis of context, needs and return-on-investment at the district nor at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Weak funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Transportation of necessary assistance (for example, transporting goods from other countries will take a long time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Inaccessible terrain, Tajikistan is a mountainous country, and many villages are inaccessible in winter. Sometimes it is impossible to provide timely assistance to remote villages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Support in evidence-based analysis of the context, and emphasize the importance of HSC&L preparedness in the country
- Support in seeking financial investments in logistics preparedness
- Organise/participate at National Policy dialogues and propose the topic of HSC&L preparedness agenda (advocacy) – so increase decentralised engagement in national policy processes
- Provide assistance in organizing a prepared rapid response team, trained volunteers are highly needed
- Regular trainings in places where emergencies and safety occur both among men and women, children (schools).
- Remake (if possible) premises for shelter of the affected from disasters population.
- Population of hard-to-reach places should organize a stock of food products and non-food essentials.
- Every family should have essentials bags (emergency bags)
- Create a control system for the fulfilment of set tasks

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

International and local NGOs

3.2 Strategic planning for HSC&L Preparedness as relevant in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.
Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

**Existing capacities**
- During the Government meetings the financial reports are done, and new budget planning are endorsed, however funds separately for HSC&L preparedness are not allocated
- There is good understanding of the value of investing in the national HSC&L preparedness function in times of crisis at central level.

There is a legal framework for preparation and response in emergency situations. Also, other ministries and departments, including the CoES, have strategic plans for disaster response. The existence of REACT as a coordinating mechanism for preparation and response to emergencies and safety is a good example of joint planning.

**Gaps/challenges**
- Roadmap or strategy to support HSC&L preparedness has not been developed in the country
- Weak capacities to plan and budget accurately at all levels
- CoES is dependant from outside investments as funds allocated is not enough - resource base is not reliable.

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
- Capacity building in elaboration of roadmap to support HSC&L preparedness in country at central level
- Support in CoES elaboration (consultations, advises and engagements), advocacy to include in the budget HSC&L preparedness expenditures
- Capability development in budgeting and planning at all levels

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

REACT partners

**3.3 Sustainable financing for HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.**

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

**Existing capacities**
- There is a legal framework, which certainly is an opportunity and potential in this direction
- Finance is allocated, national budget exists but not specifically for HSC&L preparedness
- Interest and understanding of preparedness agenda

**Gaps/challenge**
- Limited budget allocation for HSC&L preparedness
- Resource base is not reliable as CoES is dependant from Agencies (UN, INGOs)
- Complex mechanism
- Budget deficit (money is allocated for urgent and important)
- Lack of budget and finance specialists.

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
- Capacity enhancement of CoES at high level for prioritizations of budget allocations (promote equitable financing mechanisms for national HSC&L preparedness at national and at local levels)
- Strengthen coordination of development interventions beyond HSC&L to map out development needs and partners who can support HSC&L support financially (e.g.: explore national private sector for partnership and cost-sharing)
- Train highly qualified specialists and consider the financing mechanism for emergency situations and security

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

**International NGOs**

### 3.4 Financial management systems.

**Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.**

**Existing capacities**

- Funds are distributed and the finance team is accountable to the government
- Local staff of CoES do not receive funds enough and not in timely manner
- Sub-national and local levels are aware of budget allocations, but they are not always aware of the value (how much was it allocated)

**Gaps/challenges**

- Financial support arrives with considerable delay sometimes, most of the time it is not enough
- Budget is allocated only in times of crises but not in times of peace and stability
- Payments (and expenses) are not made under the HSC&L
- Bureaucracy in insurance companies

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Dialogue/advises to high level decision makers to prioritize funds allocations
- Support CoES in developing digitalised information system to track investments for effective and accountable implementation of logistics preparedness efforts.

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

**International NGOs, ADB, World Bank**

Actually, strategic planning and financing have been discussed at the Government meetings; the financial reports are completed, and the new budget planning has been endorsed. However, funds specifically earmarked for the HSC&L preparedness have not been allocated. There is a good understanding of the value of investing in the national HSC&L preparedness activities in times of crisis at the central level, but no corresponding actions have been planned at the sub-national level; thus bringing the rating more towards **latent** and **emergent** under this Pathway. The overall scoring is 47%.

### Pathway 4 - The National HSC&L Preparedness plan

#### 4.1 Design of the HSC&L Preparedness Plan

**Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.**

The legal framework exists which structure should respond how and where at emergencies, however the national HSC&L preparedness plan does not exist

**Gaps/challenge**
the given programs/regulation lay out the implementation role of the institutions for a general emergency response scenario
- accountability and grievance mechanism are not developed properly (it exists in the paper but not in practice)
- engagement with private sector is lacking
- infrastructure rehabilitation is planned but no financial resources are allocated

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Support in drafting and validation of HSC&L preparedness plan with clear roles and responsibilities not only at emergencies
- Facilitate and support in the preparedness plan (drafted by NLPWG) endorsement by the government (or CoES and other state actors).

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

4.2 HSC&L Preparedness Plan implementation in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

Existing capacities
- HSC&L preparedness plan does not exist so far, however the procurement standards and rules are elaborated and followed (the procurement is done through tendering process)
- Some emergency kits and essential items are centralised at CoES but not enough for the injured people (recent disaster – not all got support which also implies to a lack of vulnerability analysis and rapid report capacity)

The implementation of the emergency preparedness plan is established by the CoES in a time of peace and stability. All activities in this direction are well established. There are plans for all emergencies. Also, each department has its own plans in the event of a crisis. Actions take place according to the protocol. As for the time of the crisis, in such moments the implementation of the plan is carried out as much as possible. There are non-standard situations where the rapid response team must be actively involved.

Gaps/challenges
- Logistics capacity gaps are not identified.
- Lack of warehouses, food items at emergencies
- Lack of information sharing platform where key players could gather and discuss open questions on the custom clearances, road condition, etc.
- Dependent from external support at emergencies
- Lack of rapid post-shock vulnerability analysis capacity

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Needs assessment on digitalisation of entire HSC&L preparedness (this needs to be split into different elements – hazard analysis, vulnerability analysis, logistics analysis, emergency telecoms analysis, etc.)
- Capacity building needed for contracting, procurement, identifying potential bidders/suppliers
- Awareness campaign on information on third-party goods and service provision with affected people do not exist

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

REACT partners, NGOs

4.3 Stakeholder HSC&L implementation capacity in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

Existing capacities
- personnel for transport and warehouse management exist but with low capacity for HSC&L preparedness
- Data is collected and analysis but not digitalized
- International NGOs and UN Agencies who deals with logistics have the resources needed to be efficient and accountable and is highly interested in HSC&L preparedness measures

Gaps/challenges
- They are not very flexible; adapting to different implementing partner needs, roles and responsibilities can be complicated.
- Less work is done at local level they are only disseminated centrally through direct training and contacts. Coordination is missing among stakeholders
- There are no systems in place to verify compliance during HSC&L preparedness implementation. Compliance levels are unknown.

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?
- Conduct a comprehensive Learning Needs Assessment to identify and categorised capability gaps, and before this, as above, we need to “split” out the various areas in which we find that individual capacities are low. To be further discussed in operational plan drafting
- Provide capacity building program for the involved staff at all levels (logisticians should be equipped with the skills needed to use digital systems and devices (e.g. GPS devices installed in the vehicles, etc.)
- Support in developing of comprehensive guidelines and information awareness campaign
- Strengthening coordination in HSC&L preparedness

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

REACT partners

4.4 Accountability and Grievance management as relevant to HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

Existing capacities
- Formal grievance mechanism exists (journal for registering grievances, suggestions, boxes), but it does not work properly

Gaps/challenges
No willingness for grievance and accountability, thus, information regarding support provided it is not always transparent this is a critical issue – and potentially a delicate political one – it needs to be understood before the below entry points can be considered.

- GM is not existing therefore no statistics
- No funds are allocated
- M&E system is not functioning which could incorporate GM
- Lack of awareness campaign among population

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Capacity building program to design and develop effective grievance management system (**mechanism) for emergencies managed by the HSC&L preparedness
- Support in rolling out the grievance mechanism for emergency response operations in relation with HSC&L
- Support in creation of population awareness campaign

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

Local and International NGOs

The legal framework exists on responsibilities of involved actors during emergencies; however, the national HSC&L preparedness plan has not been developed so far. Logistical data is collected and analysed but not digitalized, nor stored in one dedicated place. International NGOs and UN Agencies with logistics resources are highly interested in HSC&L preparedness measures, but the logistics preparedness coordination mechanism is lacking at both national and sub-national levels. Participants have rated Pathway 4 to be latent in the sub-components of logistics preparedness plan as the plan itself does not exist in the country. Nevertheless, overall capacity such as procurement rules, personnel for transport and warehouse management are in place and exist, but there is low capacity for HSC&L preparedness.

Pathway 5 - Engagement of other actors in HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability

5.1 In HSC&L Preparedness Plan design

Describe existing capacities, main gaps, and challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing capacities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholders from civil society organisations are aware of CoES mandate and initiatives at emergencies but not initiatives in times of peace and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They take ownership for the measures within their mandate without special focus on HSC&amp;L preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State and non-state organisations meet in REACT meetings but only in times of crises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State actors are accountable to government, non-state actors do not provide data on activities done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gaps/challenges

- Platform for dialogue between state and non-state actors does not exist for HSC&L preparedness,
- Exchange of information relating to implementation of the functions are done but only in time of crisis
- No trainings have been provided on HSC&L preparedness for state and non-state actors
- Monitoring of the measures taken by state actors are not done
- Non-state actors have limited engagement in the design and implementation of CoES preparedness initiative, i.e they are not aware.

**What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?**

- Reinforce information sharing platform and improve cooperation between state and non-state actors especially in the HSC&L preparedness agenda
- Support CoES to increase the engagement of state and non-state actors and their contribution to design national HSC&L preparedness plan (e.g, by expanding membership in the NLPWG)
- Facilitate bilateral meetings and establish dialogue between state and non-state actors with the topic of HSC&L preparedness topic
- Provide support in involvement of Ministry of transport to the given project to identify the potential for HSC&L

**Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?**

No information

### 5.2 In HSC&L Preparedness Plan implementation in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.

**Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.**

**Existing capacities**

- Civil society organisations support and contribute to improve disaster risk preparedness and response, but national HSC&L preparedness implementation is not stressed as a separate agenda.

**Gaps/challenges**

- There are no clear definitions of the roles and responsibilities of non-state actors in the national plan for the preparation of humanitarian supply chains and logistics.
- There is a lack of technology and technical innovations that could help to strengthen the approach to the preparation of the HSC&L to address issues of disaster preparedness.
- There are no organizations and institutions in the country authorized to conduct scientific research and introduce technical innovations in terms of the preparation of the HSC&L.
- The private sector and local communities are not involved in the process and do not contribute to the implementation of the national plan for the preparation of the HSC&L.
- There is no special fund for conducting scientific research on the preparation of the HSC&L. There is no platform for information exchange and measures for coordination of activities.

**What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?**

- Conduct a stakeholder analysis for the HSC&L preparedness plan.
- Define the functions of other actors to contribute to the implementation of the HSC&L preparedness plan.
- Collaborate with national and international research institutes to improve and streamline technologies in HSC&L.
- Support CoES in establishing an information exchange platform through which civil society and the private sector could be involved, as indicated above.
- Support the implementation of a capacity building program for civil society organizations and the private sector to enable them to contribute to the implementation of the HSC&L preparedness plan.

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?
No information

5.3 Research, development, and innovation in HSC&L

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

**Existing capacity**
- There is willingness and readiness to learn on existing innovations.

**Gaps**
- Little awareness and no discussions regarding research and innovations

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Compile and present existing research activities with existing innovations and establish a communication with relevant institutions
- Support CoES in establishing a relevant research agenda, initiatives, and mechanisms to promote research in the field of HSC&L preparedness in country

Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?
No information

5.4 Sustainable human capital in HSC&L

Describe existing capacities, main gaps and challenges.

**Existing capacity**
- Willingness and preparedness to learn

**Gaps**
- Awareness is missing

What needs to happen to address gaps and raise capacity?

- Support in awareness campaign and partnerships with academic institutions and increase learning opportunities in HSC&L sector
- Support in organising on-the job trainings to improve capacities of logisticians
- Organise study tours to other countries for CoES responsible staff for learning and experience exchanges
Are any partners already working to support stakeholders in this area? Who, where and in what way?

No information

Findings of the given pathway emphasizes that the stakeholders from civil society organisations are aware of CoES mandate and activities during emergencies, but not in times of peace and stability. State and non-state organisations meet at REACT meetings in times of crises only. Additionally, while state actors are accountable for reporting to the Government, non-state actors do not provide data of their activities. Both state and non-state actors engaged in HSC&L Preparedness do not have a platform for dialogues, coordination, and exchange of logistics information. Civil society organisations support and contribute for the improvement of disaster preparedness and response through their short-term projects, but national HSC&L preparedness implementation is not stressed as a separate agenda in the projects. Therefore, the general rating for this Pathway is rather latent than emergent with overall scoring of 24 %.

The picture of overall scoring diagram is as follows:

### CNM Rating by Pathway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Rating %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1</td>
<td>The HSC&amp;L policy and regulatory environment</td>
<td>58 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 2</td>
<td>CoES Institutional effectiveness and accountability</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 3</td>
<td>Strategic planning and financing for HSC&amp;L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.</td>
<td>47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 4</td>
<td>The National HSC&amp;L Preparedness plan</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 5</td>
<td>Engagement of other actors in HSC&amp;L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability.</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommended next steps based on the CNM findings:...
It was proposed to support CoES as the main emergency management governmental body in enhancing HSC&L preparedness in the national emergency preparedness and response regulatory instrument. Additionally, CoES proposed to map relevant international and regional initiatives including HSC&L topics and disseminate them through appropriate platforms to a wide range of institutional players as part of lessons learned and best practice sharing.

Conclusion

The analysis revealed that of the five capacity pathways, the existing capacity related to engagement and participation of other actors (Pathway 5) and the capacity pathway related to national HSC&L preparedness plan (Pathway 4) was relatively weak. Though the pathway related to policy and regulatory environment (Pathway 1) appeared comparatively sufficient, the strategic planning and financing of HSC&L preparedness (Pathway 3) still required more engagement of CoES and support to enhance its effectiveness. The capacity bundles of the institutional effectiveness and accountability of CoES in times of peace and stability (Pathway 2) required further strengthening.

To summarize the results of this exercise, the participants agreed that the national HSC&L preparedness system needs to be strengthened through establishing a coordination mechanism and creation of information exchange portal on logistics preparedness. Additionally, a National Logistics Preparedness Action Plan needs to be developed by the NLPWG and endorsed by CoES for further implementation by NLPWG members.