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Session 0 – Introduction & Welcome

The Global Logistics Cluster (GLC) Preparedness Design Workshop was a historic moment for Logistics Cluster Preparedness; it was the largest workshop since the Field-Based Preparedness Project (FBPP) was established in the 2016 Logistics Cluster strategy, with 84 participants, stationed in over 24 countries, attending the workshop, 56 attending in-person.

The new Logistics Cluster strategy for 2022-2026 has a strong emphasis on preparedness at all levels, from working together as a community of international responders at the global level to supporting national governments in their capacity strengthening activities at the national level. The GLC Coordinator highlighted the importance of the humanitarian sector coming together through a dedicated workshop where all participants actively contribute to exploring the long-term vision and role of the Logistics Cluster community in preparedness efforts. However, while planning capacity strengthening activities, consideration should be given to impact measurement to demonstrate the role of preparedness in helping save lives and resources for humanitarian stakeholders.

The purpose of the workshop was to examine how the Logistics Cluster community can contribute to improving preparedness and what activities and methods partners do and do not want to see from the Logistics Cluster. The outcomes of the discussions were consolidated into a two-year Logistics Cluster Preparedness Roadmap to guide future activities.

Session 0.1 – What is Preparedness in the Logistics Cluster?

Per the IASC Reference Module,

“Preparedness is a continuous process. Broadly defined, it includes any action, measure, or capacity development that is introduced before an emergency to improve the overall effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of a response and recovery.”

There are three levels of preparedness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-Agency</th>
<th>Builds the over-arching framework to guide the collective action of all potential humanitarian responders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International community preparing as responders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector/Cluster</td>
<td>Defines how agencies will work together to achieve sector-specific objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five areas of preparedness covering global, national, and localised activities were discussed:

**Areas of Preparedness**

Session 1 – Field-Based Preparedness

Latin America & the Caribbean Region (LAC)

In the LAC region, the team implements both a regional and subregional approach to preparedness. The regions have been categorized into Latin America, the Caribbean, and Central America to create a sense of community amongst the partners in each of these areas, allowing improved knowledge of and collaboration with other agencies. At the country level, digital solutions are being implemented. This includes existing tools and digital strategies to make services more easily available to all, particularly the national disaster management officers.

Africa & Middle East Region

In the Africa and Middle East region, preparedness efforts have been structured in a country-by-country approach to address the specific contexts. For Malawi and Zimbabwe, this meant improving coordination and storage capacity; in Iraq, the focus was supporting the development of a common national preparedness plan; in Madagascar and Sierra
Leone, the team supported the establishment of working groups and supported the national disaster management authority (NDMA), respectively; and in Mozambique the preparedness efforts focused on sharing lessons learned from Cyclones Kenneth and Idai. At the start of 2022, Kenya was the only active FBPP country in the region with their preparedness efforts focused on working closely with two participating counties to strengthen capacity.

Asia & Pacific Region

Eight countries are currently active in preparedness efforts in the Asia and Pacific region. The region has emphasised the formation of national logistics working groups to encourage stakeholders to be aware of the primary humanitarian logistics actors as well as country level capacity. NDMAs have engaged in trainings in humanitarian supply chain.

Session 1.1 – National Perspective (Stakeholder Panel Discussion)

A stakeholder panel discussion with participants from host governments gave workshop attendees an insight into national perspectives. The participants represented host governments from Kenya, Guatemala, Zimbabwe, Bhutan, and Vanuatu.

The panel received questions about their experiences with the preparedness project, the relationships between different actors in their country, and what they had found most successful or challenging through both preparedness efforts and previous responses. One of the most emphasised points from the panel participants was the need to fit action plans to the local context with input from the government and community. Examples of consideration for the local context included incorporating local processes, including administrative and legal, as well as considering the role and training first responders. They felt the focus on stakeholders in preparedness efforts helps design action plans around what is specifically needed, with input from relevant actors, and assign those roles to the organisations best suited to them with the goal of aligning the missions of all actors during a response.

Several of the challenges brought up by the panel included the balance between receiving outside support and using national resources to respond faster and effectively. It was noted that in some contexts, it can be challenging to bring in outside resources, so it is essential in that context to have prepositioned items and trained actors locally to respond immediately. The participant from Vanuatu suggested it was important to establish boundaries to allow communities to begin their own assessments and activities using their trainings and knowledge of the area. They can then request the specific assistance that is needed from the national, regional, and international levels.
Session 1.2 – Preparedness Challenges (Group Discussion)

The workshop continued into a discussion session in which attendees were divided into groups to discuss challenges in emergency preparedness efforts at the national and international levels.

Some of the key challenges highlighted included management of transition phases, coordination, and lack of visibility. Staff rotation impacts projects through the loss of institutional knowledge, however the handover between agencies was the larger discussion point of the groups. The discussion highlighted the differences in structure between international and national agencies as well as the struggle to work closely with appropriate counterparts and to make a handover successful, by assigning roles to the agency with the correct mandate. Finally, the lack of visibility was thought to be a concern at both national and international levels with international organisations lacking local information and access and national organisations not having adequate data on resources/relief item stock in country. Additional challenges regarding the sustainability of resources and inclusion of climate change in preparedness planning were also discussed by the groups, primarily as a national challenge.

Proposed solutions to these challenges focused on improving communication and coordination. The discussion groups suggested continuous consultation and cooperation between agencies, both public and private, at national and regional levels, to ensure common understanding, aligned strategy, and broader awareness of preparedness efforts. It was additionally suggested that multi-stakeholder funding be considered, and that funding would be more effective if tied to an objective rather than a timeline.

The groups were then asked to discuss their understanding of capacity strengthening and what principles should be applied in capacity strengthening activities. The groups felt that capacity strengthening was identifying the gaps and needs in a local context and eliminating or reducing those gaps with appropriate activities. Many groups highlighted knowledge transfer as a key activity, and emphasised adapting to the local context as crucial. Other principles discussed were inclusivity and connectivity between groups as well as activity sustainability by having an effective exit strategy to ensure continuity.

Session 2 – Institutional Capacity Strengthening and Preparedness Enabler’s Guide

The Institutional Capacity Strengthening initiative, including the Preparedness Enabler’s Guide (PEG), was presented to the attendees. The guide was developed to support actors in capacity-strengthening activities, and it was noted that the primary practitioners of the guide are national actors. The PEG was under peer review and expected to be published in 2023.
Session 3 – Measuring Impact/Change

The Center for Humanitarian Logistics and Regional Development (CHORD) presented their research on measuring the impact of supply chain preparedness. Measuring the value added of preparedness investments is a consistent challenge and their research was not intended to provide perfect solutions. They developed a theoretical system for measuring impact with the help of funding from HELP Logistics and Kuhne University. The approach was used in the Philippines to see if it was possible to achieve results by connecting theory and practice. To measure the results, they looked at areas including leadership management, talent management, food systems, and health systems.

To optimise preparedness investment efforts based on their observations, actors should focus on understanding the dynamics and complexity of humanitarian systems and supply chains, and noted it is important to have a baseline measure of the local system before investment to be able to measure the change. In the subsequent system adjustment during preparedness implementation, it is important that practitioners ensure any changes retain necessary links to other connected systems (regional, national, commercial etc), and consider the impact of major shocks.

The team emphasised that measuring impact is a continuous process and there are many frameworks to choose from, but the SCOR model was noted as the most prevalent. Actors interested in investing should decide on a metric system, collect baseline data, and use a framework to develop their investment plan. The goal is to connect investment and activities to strategy and measurement.

Session 4 – Customs and Importation

The IMPACCT Working Group lead presented the work of IMPACCT, noting that the group exists to help humanitarian responders deal with bureaucratic and administrative impediments to access, specifically in customs and importation, in several strategic areas.

Participants then divided into groups to address a set of questions regarding IMPACCT’s preparedness efforts. One group was asked to discuss the country selection process. This group suggested that countries with high complexity in their customs processes should be supported first, including changing regulations, more bureaucracy, fewer commercial links, embargos, or sanctions, etc. The other selection criteria listed was direct request from country or partners, with higher numbers of requests increasing the prioritisation of the country.

The second group was asked to discuss the needs of the humanitarian logistics community. This group started with a discussion of goods that should be considered in any humanitarian importations and customs efforts in a country and listed the primary goods of interest as medical items, food, telecommunications equipment, and vehicles. The next need highlighted was information on entry point infrastructure, with interest in
permit requirements, whether carriers cover permits, blockages and delays. The final area of discussion was around linking with the national counterparts and institutionalising IMPACCT. Suggestions were to improve engagement with government stakeholders to ensure all information is available online, discuss solutions for common humanitarian challenges, and ensure that IMPACCT’s position in the Logistics Cluster is embedded so that the work can be maintained over time.

**Session 5 – Stock Prepositioning**

The goal of the session was to take stock of the status of stock prepositioning. Initiatives in prepositioning have already been undertaken by organisations such as IFRC, and UNHRD. The International Humanitarian City model was another initiative that was discussed. The STOCKHOLM system was presented, which examines both prepositioned stocks and the last 40 years of disasters in a country to understand the status and needs of the country was discussed. Using their model, the goal was to reduce silos of information for a better understanding of all stock levels in each country.

The discussion then reached out for input from the attendees to list the main challenges for prepositioning. The table below shows the challenges listed at the national and regional levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Level</th>
<th>Regional Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access after disaster</td>
<td>Carbon footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Cold chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Customs procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and budget</td>
<td>Funding and cost efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Stock rotation and shelf life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock rotation and shelf life</td>
<td>Strategy and risk-benefit analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse conditions</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities and areas for improving prepositioning were discussed. Attendees highlighted the value of pooling resources and enabling a faster response during an emergency. They also saw opportunities for better availability of storage facilities, easier stock rotation, and improved coordination and collaboration between actors. Regarding changes that should be made to prepositioning efforts, attendees recommended using unbranded items, agreeing on items to stock ahead of time, better warehouse management, improving coordination to reduce duplication, prioritizing required items, and considering country stocks when making a prepositioning strategy. They also discussed the need to consider risk analysis for prepositioning, such as the risk of a warehouse with prepositioned items flooding when set up to support an area with expected flooding.

*Click link here for more specific outcome detail of the stock-prepositioning session.*
Session 6 – Operational Preparedness

In the discussion on operational preparedness, the participants were asked to discuss recommendations for how to best embed preparedness into the Logistics Cluster strategy and discuss common challenges between preparedness and operational activities. Participants felt that roles of all actors needed to be clarified regarding both operations and preparedness to make the activities successful during and after the transition. Participants also underscored the value of mapping all logistics capacity in a country and agreements with the private sector to provide experts and in-kind support.

Differences discussed between operational preparedness and field-based preparedness projects were centred around the audience and project length. The key stakeholders of operational preparedness are the partners operating in country, including those that have less awareness of local context, but have experience from other emergencies. For longer term preparedness projects like the FBPP, the key stakeholder is primarily government counterparts, who have greater knowledge of the local context but less broad emergency experience, with the goal of long-term capacity strengthening. It is essential to build knowledge amongst local partners in both types of preparedness.

When asked to list challenges with mapping logistics capacity, specifically regarding the Logistics Capacity Assessments (LCAs), partners discussed challenges falling into three categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>The roles of stakeholders in the process are not truly clear to actors. There should be more clarity on the roles played by stakeholders in data collection and verification. Ownership of the tool and the information was also listed as a challenge for the LCA with questions as to whether the government or local partners should own the tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Access to information was listed as a considerable challenge with some data being unavailable or being deemed too sensitive to be shared publicly. It was suggested that examples of the information needed can be shared with the government and partners to provide greater clarity on the information needs of the mapping exercise. The explanation should be clear about how information collected will be used and by whom, so it is understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Participants also felt the structure of the tool should be revisited. The tool was originally designed for use by World Food Programme (WFP). It is not used as a partner tool and should be redesigned to fit the needs of partners. Specifically, they felt the structure should be less focused on food, contain more information on medical items, be written in the local language, and should be updated more frequently so that it is not outdated when an emergency strikes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were also asked to provide suggestions on the best way to embed preparedness into transition strategies. Suggestions included coordination with national authorities to allow for a more permanent foundation to make transitions easier, inclusion of preparedness activities and exit strategies from the beginning of a response, using existing capacity, guidelines, tools, and resources to avoid duplication.

Session 7 – Cross-Cutting Topics

Palladium – Risk Rating Tool

The session presented by Palladium discussed their push to hold service providers and suppliers used by the humanitarian community to a certain standard of conduct. They noted that, although the humanitarian community has specific requirements, contractors are not always conscious of these standards. As part of their research, Palladium sent out a survey to contractors to gain insight into their structure and behaviour regarding these standards. The survey received many responses that showed many contractors had policies such as anti-discrimination and whistle blowing, but there was not as much coverage for sexual exploitation.

Following this exercise, Palladium increased their due diligence and raised expectations above baseline in their contracts, communicating to suppliers the need to start adapting to these policies to continue working together. Palladium has also created a rating tool to help identify the risk of sexual exploitation in a country based on the context and answers. They are also putting together packages with trainings, information, and resources to support the system wide use of the standards, so it is not a surprise to suppliers, and they do not need to balance varied requirements. If the humanitarian community joins together, it will provide greater leverage and encourage suppliers to conform to these policies.

WREC

The session presented by the WREC project discussed the overall goal of the WREC project, which is to reduce waste and pollution generated by humanitarian operations.

In relation to preparedness, the WREC project supports understanding of green procurement and mapping waste management capacity to contribute to localisation. They link local actors, share guidance, and work to improve coordination and avoid duplication of effort. They are working to create discussion on what organisations are doing to support environmental sustainability, how those activities could be done together, and sharing that knowledge at the local level.

The project is conducting several meetings in 2023 to raise awareness and receive feedback on what organisations need in general and specifically from the WREC project so they can plan for and support those needs.
ECHO

ECHO led a session to discuss their Humanitarian Logistics Policy (HLP). ECHO published their HLP in early 2022 because they realized there was no current logistics policy from a donor. As logistics represents between 60 and 80 percent of humanitarian operational budgets, they felt there were significant opportunities for gains in this area. The goal of the policy: to support a more efficient and effective humanitarian response, to support the greening of humanitarian aid, and to raise the profile of humanitarian aid. They accept proposals for funding to support humanitarian organisations, in line with their HLP, with one such proposal window closing shortly after the workshop.

ECHO introduced the European Humanitarian Response Capacity (EHRC) services. There are three main types of services provided: stockpiles, common logistics services (humanitarian aid flights, transport services, and warehousing), and expertise. EHRC operates through a mixture of implementation modalities, in which ECHO retains decision making on strategic and operational matters, including grants, HACA/IMDA, direct procurement, and non-financial donations.

End of Workshop Preparedness Roadmap Consolidation

The Preparedness Roadmap for 2023 to 2024 was consolidated at the end of the workshop and used in Logistics Cluster activity planning. The roadmap is a live document so may be updated at any time.
Annex

Workshop Agenda

LOGISTICS CLUSTER
ANNUAL PREPAREDNESS MEETING
January 2023 - Agenda

Monday 23
H10 Hotel – Lobby Bar

18.00  ♻ Reception @ H10 Hotel, Lobby Bar

Day 1 – Tuesday 24
H10 Hotel – Plenary “Campo Marzio/Trevi” / Breakout 1 “Ripa” / Breakout 2 “Trastevere”

8.45    ✈️ Arrival
9.00    ☕️ Welcome, agenda, objectives, administrative remarks
9.30    📖 What is Preparedness in Logistics Cluster, Strategy Implementation Plan (SIP)
10.00   ☕️ Coffee and Thematic Islands exchange
10.30   🕒 1 Field-Based Preparedness – Plenary Introduction
11.00   … National Perspective – Stakeholder Panel Discussion
12.00   … Workshop
13.00   🍽️ Lunch
14.00   … Wrap-up
14.30   ✈️ 2 Institutional Capacity Strengthening (ICS) and Preparedness Enabler’s Guide (PEG)
15.00   … Workshop
15.30   ☕️ Coffee during workshop session
16.00   … Wrap-up
16.30   Day 1 Closure, Roadmap Consolidation
19.00   🎬 Social Evening (Restaurant outside venue in Rome centre)

Day 2 - Wednesday 25
H10 Hotel – Plenary “Campo Marzio/Trevi” / Breakout 1 “Ripa” / Breakout 2 “Trastevere”

8.45    ✈️ Arrival
9.00    ☕️ Recap day 1 & daily planning
9.15    ✈️ 3 Measure Change / Impact – Plenary Introduction
9.45    … Workshop
10.45   … Wrap-up

解放思想
# LOGISTICS CLUSTER
## ANNUAL PREPAREDNESS MEETING
### January 2023 - Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>Coffee and Thematic Islands exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>4 Customs and Importation - Plenary Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>... Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Lunch and Group Picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>... Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>5 Stock Prepositioning - Plenary Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>... Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>Coffee during workshop session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>... Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>Day 2 Closure, Roadmap Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Social Evening (Restaurant outside venue in Rome centre)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 3 - Thursday 26**

H10 Hotel – Plenary “Campo Marzio/Trevi” / Breakout 1 “Ripa” / Breakout 2 “Trastevere”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Recap day 2 &amp; daily planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>6 Operational Preparedness - Plenary Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>... Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Coffee and Thematic Islands exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>... Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>7 Cross-Cutting Topics - Plenary Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Preparedness Working Group Reinitiation 2023– Plenary Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>Roadmap Consolidation, SIP, Recommendations, Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>... Wrap-up and Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Workshop Closure, Farewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>Departure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hybrid session, Coffee, Tea, Dinner*
Access to the live Roadmap here.