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Background and objective of the CNM, linking to national HSC&L preparedness and the NLPWG

Committee of Emergency Situations under the Government of Tajikistan (CoES), being the leading government agency for emergency management, with the support of the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP) and the Global Logistics Cluster’s Field Based Preparedness Project (FBPP), carried out on 14 December 2021 a Capacity Needs Mapping exercise (CNM) with the National Logistics Preparedness Working Group (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 but not the capacity of individual stakeholder. Furthermore, 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

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 capacities due to financial constraints, heavy reliance on external assistance, 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 multiply limitations. This capacity exists but with limited national budget allocation, largely dependent on external funding. **Moderate** capacity sees the capacity development with strong political will to support HSC&L enhancement and progress, opportunity for increasing national allocation of resources, 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 had a detailed set of guiding questions to discuss and ensure a holistic approach to assessing the system and the capacities defined by the Capacity Outcome Statement. 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 have been involved in the CNM discussion. The participants were introduced with the capacity needs mapping process and received the necessary information about the purpose and objectives of the workshop. Each group (by thematic pathways) had a set of specific ‘guiding questions’ and was asked to note gaps, recommendations, and lessons learned.

Main findings of the CNM

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 with five-critical pathways that are required for sustainability. The main findings of the pathways with rating are as follows:
Pathway 1. HSC&L policy and regulatory environment
Overall participants agreed that the local actors are facilitated in delivering timely and appropriate emergency response services because a relevant sectoral policy and legislative framework clearly outlines institutional responsibilities for national humanitarian supply chain and logistics. Whereas there is policy and regulatory environment that supports HSC&L preparedness in country, the entire regulations cover only emergency situations but do not mention 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 a relevant sectoral policy and legislative framework clearly outlines institutional responsibilities for national humanitarian supply chain and logistics. Nonetheless, the institutions are accountable to the Government only in relation to times of crisis, while no mentioning is made of complementarities in times of peace and stability.

Pathway 2. Institutional effectiveness and accountability
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. CoES is facilitated in overseeing and coordinating the delivery of timely and appropriate support; however, coordination between key players is missing, especially in times of peace and stability (e.g., 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 are drawbacks to delivering CoES support for logistics preparedness. Additionally, coordination and information management to discuss logistics preparedness was identified as shortcomings of CoES institutional effectiveness. However, there is political will and readiness of CoES to improve it. 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.
During the Government meetings, the financial reports are done, and new budget planning are endorsed. However, funds specifically earmarked for HSC&L preparedness are not allocated. There is good understanding of the value of investing in national HSC&L preparedness function in times of crisis at central level, but no corresponding actions are planned at sub-national level, thus bringing the rating more towards latent and emergent under this Pathway. Overall scoring is 47%.

Pathway 4. National HSC&L Preparedness plan
The legal framework exists about responsibilities of involved actors at emergencies; however, the national HSC&L preparedness plan has not been developed so far. Logistical data is collected and analysed but not digitalized and not stored in one dedicated place. International NGOs and UN Agencies who deal with logistics have the resources needed to be efficient and accountable and are highly interested in HSC&L preparedness measures. Additionally, the logistics preparedness coordination mechanism is lacking at 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 is in place, i.e. the procurement rules exist, personnel for transport and warehouse management exist but with low capacity for HSC&L preparedness and rated 24%.

Pathway 5. Engagement of other actors in HSC&L Preparedness in times of crisis and in times of peace and stability
Stakeholders from civil society organisations are aware of CoES mandate and initiatives at emergencies but not initiatives in times of peace and stability. State and non-state organisations meet in REACT meetings but only in times of crises. Additionally, while state actors are accountable to the Government, non-state actors do not provide data on their activities. Actors are engaged in HSC&L
Preparedness; however, a platform for dialogue between state and non-state actors does not exist for HSC&L preparedness, as exchange of information relating to implementation of the functions are done only in times of crisis. Civil society organisations support and contribute to improving disaster preparedness and response, but national HSC&L preparedness implementation is not stressed as a separate agenda. 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:

**Recommended next steps based on the CNM findings**

It was recommended to support CoES as the main emergency management governmental body in addressing HSC&L preparedness in the national emergency preparedness and response regulatory instrument and mechanism. 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.

To summarize the results of this exercise, the participants agreed that the national HSC&L preparedness system needs to be enhanced 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 NLPWG and endorsed by CoES for further implementation by NLPWG.
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