The Obstacle of Humanitarian Aid in Natural Disaster: Public Administration Approach

Noppawan Phuengpha[✉]

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Political Science and Law, Burapha University, Saen Suk, Thailand
noppawan974@gmail.com

Abstract. Most of the previous studies in natural disasters focus on the science field, geography field, medical, public health, engineer, and logistics system. In social science, notably fewer studies explain in the public administration field. Therefore, this article tries to fulfill the gap in public administration field and disaster management, the writer set two aims of this article; to analyze the obstacles of humanitarian aid in a natural disaster and to propose a solution by using public administration terms. This study is systematic reviews by using a different online database with a similar keyword for searching. The writer found that there are three main obstacles, firstly lacking cooperation among donors and between donors and affected countries. Secondly, different aims and criteria among actors. Thirdly actors cannot meet the need for affected people. The writer proposed a network governance concept for manage in policy level and operational level. Freely sharing human resources and resources of actors is a strong point of network governance. The network form can save time for cooperation can save cost; the actors need to set the core cooperator of each network to run smoothly.

Keywords: Humanitarian aid · Natural disaster · Network governance

1 Introduction

The studies of global hazard in natural disasters reported that the trend between 1970 and 2010 showed hydrological was the highest that more than two times of other, followed by geophysical, meteorological, climatological, and biological. Another report presented the global population face the risk of a natural disaster. The statistic of Asian developing countries showed population of some country in Oceania, Central Asia and Southeast Asia face with the risk in natural disaster. Most of them suffer from low hazard. Five to eight percent of the population face with high danger.

The tragedies events of natural disasters in the past as the earthquake and tsunami 2004, it urged the global people to be aware of vulnerable to the power of the natural The impact of natural disasters leads to a higher trend of migration [23]. On the other hand, the cause of natural change comes from human-made; for example, rapid urbanization is an area prone to earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, and landslides; climate change; environmental degradation; and violent conflict. In terms of assistance, United Nations

Development Programme (UNDP) reports the trend in humanitarian aid between 1970 to 2004. It is gradually higher that it rose up from 200 US$ to 5,500 US$ [1].

The previous studies presented that humanitarian aid in disaster management faced with obstacles that lead to ineffective assistance. There are five main results; firstly, the amount of financing for help depends on the case of a disaster that provides different assistance patterns. Also, donor countries reduce aid when they want to stimulate affected countries. Secondly, the national aid model is suitable as the recovery and reconstruction in the Wenchuan earthquake, China. National Counterpart Aid (NCA) model succeeded [2]. Thirdly, grants for house rebuilding and repairs are inequality and the house rebuilding programs were not the main program as the case of post-tsunami in Sri Lanka. Fourthly, the linkage of the quality and capacity of each humanitarian actor is essential [3]. Fifthly, there is no one model that suitable for management in all disaster cases [4]. Proux, Hager and Klein present eight models for the nonprofit organizations of a country. They propose a collaborative model in domestic cooperation and international cooperation [5]. Some reports found in the same issue that humanitarian aid need operation of various actors that can share the strong capacity of each actor, for example, sharing experts, knowledge, skills, experiences, technologies, and devices. Some studies presented that involvement of the public such as communities for planning, can lead to more success. This article focuses on two purposes. Firstly, to review the obstacle of humanitarian aid in natural disasters. Secondly, to find out the suitable way for humanitarian assistance in a natural disaster in the future.

2   Theories and Concepts

2.1   Humanitarian Aid

According to the Global Humanitarian Assistance (GHA) explain that humanitarian aid is the support and aim to save lives, reduce suffering with equality in during and after disaster. The definition provides differences pattern of outside country and development aid; the first, it related to the principle of humanity or kindness, neutrality from any group, impartiality serve for all, and independence from political agenda—the second, activities in the post-disaster of a disaster intended to be short term. In practice, the problems occur in the condition of to classify during or aftermath because of some cases, prolonged vulnerability. Humanitarian function broadly; the first is a rapid response to disasters that overwhelm a country's capacities. The second is the support of basic services for daily life under crisis due to any conflict or natural disaster. The third is provision resilience and enhancing local capacity for equal response. And fourth is support on victims [6].

Tradition activities of humanitarian aids focus on reducing the suffering that can create categories to three groups. The first group devices relief aid and services such as temporary housing, drinking water, basic medicines, and so on. The second group crisis food aid for aftermath distribution and supplementary food for malnutrition group. And the third group coordination for relief, security and support vehicles or communication devices [7].

2.2 Network Governance

Network governance became a prominent phenomenon in societies that showed network social to link individuals by networks, extended and reduce the pattern of working, international and local level, strong connection between agencies, low level of connection among various actors, horizontally structure, excellent communication [8]. Network governance requires different actors as citizens, businesses, and nonprofit organizations to become coproducers. Network governance could be used in a various term such as partnership, tri-sector partnership, joined-up governance, interactive governance, community governance, participatory management, cooperation management, cooperation governance, the new public governance, stakeholder governance, new social partnerships and so on [9].

Network governance can enhance a balance among actors, making citizens satisfying, and so on [10]. In them of the process, it is a different process in different stages. The last one is the working characteristic to achieve aims. All issues may be new definitions or new challenges in network governance context [11].

The concept of network, it is focus on categorize into three approaches, namely: policy network, network management, and network governance. Policy networks include the policy formulation process that proposes the needs of state agencies, interest groups, and civil society. The network means a structure in the operation procedure that leads to immediate decision-making situations such as during natural disasters. The case needs a mix of skills and the capacity of various actors. The crises beyond a single organization capacity, therefore, require a network [12]. Network governance is the basic role of state authorities in implementation term, some controlling, and steering other actors [13].

The categorized of network governance can divide by role of players and coordinate activities of actors that is called as hub agencies. Each actor seems to have different rights and authority [14]. Hub agent plays an importance role in cooperation and maintaining the network structure that depends on internal factors of each actor and environment. Scholars defined various definitions; however, there are two key concepts; firstly, interaction patterns in exchange and relationship. Secondly, resources flow among independent actors [15].

The network governance as a temporal institutionalization that all actors still have autonomous and self-governing. All actors operate in sharing effort for ad hoc events. The strong point of network governance is an adjustment. Some scholars argue that the function of network governance can bring different perspectives to the meeting and solve the problem by developing new methods to work. To achieve all actor, need to enhance efficiency and effectiveness, democratic quality and capacity of public agencies and administration. The degree of network governance contribution depends on the extension of resources [16].

3 Method

The review found that clearly described humanitarian aid or foreign government aid after natural disasters, which emerged from a synthesis of secondary data. By searching from e-journal database; 1) ProQuest and 2) Emerald Insight. Other sources are

Google scholar and google website. In ProQuest use advance search and then type keyword foreign aid in post-disaster click search. Filter with a subject; foreign aid, public administration, earthquake, political science, and disaster recovery. The second search in advance search with keyword aid model and collaborative. And then filter with subject chose public administration. The third search humanitarian aid model and then filter with subject disaster, international organization, nongovernmental organization, earthquake, and disaster relief. The fourth search with key work recovery in post-tsunami and then change the keyword to recovery post-earthquake and the last keyword is recovery in post-flood. In Emerald Insight search with keyword; humanitarian aid in natural disaster. The total article from Proquest and Emerald Insight are 1,607 articles (N = 1,607), then filter with year between 2000 and 2020, and limit field of study as public administration and humanitarian aid (N = 78). The next, the writer read an abstract (N = 20). Another from Google scholar by searching humanitarian assistance in disaster. The last searching from Google to gather the report about humanitarian aid in post-disaster from donor actors.

4   Result

After the catastrophic event donor countries played on five main activities: infrastructure for social, services for social, infrastructure and service for economic term, manufacturing sector, humanitarian assistance and multi-tasks. According to Telford and Cosgrave shows in their paper that most of the donors support for reconstruction aid more than relief aid [3]. Private sector assistance is slower than private contribution. Information in the 2004 tsunami aid focus on donor government that compares the percentage of tsunami relief aid and tsunami reconstruction aid in one donor country [17].

Telford. When we look that the first level recipient of international humanitarian response between 2007 and 2011. The recipient got from a multilateral organization is about 45 to 55%. NGOs are about 20 to 29%. The public sector is about 8 to 12%. Red Cross is about 5 to 8% and from the other is about 2 to 10% (Raschky and Schwindt, 2009). Private sectors are trend to support money through NGOs and the Red Cross of the affected countries than the government. Development Assistance Committee (DAC) who donors through NGOs than non-DAC agencies. In terms of implementation, when the donors support money to UN agencies trend to hire a national implementer [2, 18].

Financial flow from the outside country can divide into committed and disbursed. One example from the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami, the almost OECD members support pledge committed higher than pledge disbursed. All some members give the same amount of both. It reaches to increasing of debt in the affected country. As the case of Sri Lanka tsunami 2004, capital expenditure increase; overall deficit raises to 9.6% of GDP after the tsunami from 7.6% [19].

In terms of financial aid support differently, amount in a different sector. Affected countries require coordination; food is the most. It is about 77 to 86%. Follow by education, shelter, water and sanitation and health. It is from about 40 to 58%. The lowest sector of demand is security protection agriculture and economic recovery. It is about 29 to 33%. While financial aid for early recovery, shelter and protection is a big gap [20]. Its consensus with UNDP report in humanitarian assistance from 2000 to 2004,

the most significant aid is in food 8,611 US$ million. Shelter and non-food items 318 US$ million and security 38 US$ million [1]. The reconstruction plan of government is hard for implementation. The cooperation is one of the main problems, 2004 tsunami Sir Lanka shows that bad coordination among agencies in domestic and outside countries face with many obstacles [21].

As the statement in Johnson's article "the Asian tsunami exposed major problems arising as a result of insufficient coordination among relief agencies, and longstanding conflict within the region" [22]. Aftermath disaster, there is aid surge to victim country. They give cash and in-kind but, in some cases, aid is not efficient because of lack of collaboration among donor itself and donor with the state. Another case, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation aid by distributing emergency food and essential medicine, but the assistance was limited in recovery housing and the improve of livelihoods to reduce the risk of people in community in the future. Also, in USAID annual report 2015 summarize the obstacle of Philippine after a typhoon, they face with not enough aid the most, followed by corruption, logistics problem, and insecurity violence. It is 48, 29, 13 and 10% respectively [23].

Some international NGOs unwillingness to be on working with the government agencies, and competitive among other agencies that was difficult to implementation. Reconstruction grant flow to the local level but in the real local level less of the recovery plan and at the national level does not have to follow up progress [24]. And the Core Humanitarian Standard Alliance shows that the reconstruction plan of government is hard for implementation [25].

In practices, diversity of actors responds in some way to humanitarian disasters, not all are considered the purpose of humanitarian assistance. Also, background of the institution; differences in organizational structures, cultures, and practices. Actors effort to humanitarian standardize these processes are not yet adequate [26]. There are no report as many humanitarian INGOs in tsunami Indian Ocean 2004 that got large money is lately for rehabilitation to reach "build back better". Even they try to make run faster with higher budget, but the project still be late. It cause the legitimacy factors and they face with more stressful. The donors must pay higher salaries. Another problem is no transparency and no financial report. The result of complete new housing area shows that the houses function were unmatched with community lifestyle [27]. Not success coordination to some degree. Organizational structures have autonomous, incentives and lines of accountability that need cooperation 2015 [28].

5   Discussion

The largest amount of humanitarian aid come from outside country. UN agencies are the most prominent response NGOs, Red Cross/Red Crescent, private organization, host government. In terms of a foreign government, the U.S is the most substantial support. The money aid is used for food the most. It is about two or three times of the aid of the others. Follow by basic need in daily life, water sanitation, health, education, infrastructure, shelter, long term program. The surge of aid depends on the severity of each natural disaster. There is no notable evidence that good relationships in political will get higher assistance. In the economic term, low GDP in recipient country more likely

to get higher assistance. Other factors such as the geography of the recipient country also relate with kind of support. The writer found three obstacles.

Firstly, unwell cooperate between donor actors and the recipient country or among actors in a country. They unconnected in implementation but in financial flow is across to others, for example, the private sector that includes individuals donate or support through their government or NGOs. In the case of typhoon Haiyan, the Philippines that in natural disaster coherence and principled humanitarian action are far easier to achieve [29].

Humanitarian aid less of cooperation in share information of demand and supply. Donors always aid be delivered in bilateral that were supported by foreign governments, international aids, NGOs directly to the affected country. In some case, staff donation is not useful because the affected country does not need. Logistics capacity from oversea and distribution to affected area inadequate. Another case. The government decides aid programs that contrast with community needs. The government has a weak capacity to aid the affected people. Another fact is less of cooperation in regulation; for example, Donors spent over time and excess funds in reconstruction that there many foreigners of the international agencies involved. Some recipient countries prohibiting external aid, some recipient governments ask for collaboration than the entire operation by external actors itself. Moreover, limited information, donors or actors did share the number of affected people, damaged households, served areas and aided affected people. In term of unwell cooperation among actors in a country for example Thailand's disaster management system has been built for forty years with various network of NGOs, academic sectors, private sector, communities, and citizen. However, the cooperation problem has been found, especially the support coordination of prevention, mitigation, and preparedness within government, the community, and humanitarian organizations [30].

Secondly, different aims and criteria among actors. Donors do not attempt to reach humanitarian standardize; competition among donor actors that sometimes they poach to local NGOs; not all diversity donor actors consider the purpose of humanitarian assistance. In terms of reconstruction, the design of the housing is not suitable for community recovery and local occupation. It is not suitable for their family lifestyle and career. Also, an area to rebuild is in the zone that far from the workplace—different methods or processes of assistance. Donors have a difference background that is hard to make coherent. Another case, unclear assessment, or index because indices were not designed for discerning changes in vulnerability and resilience attributable to disaster response; donors less realize in protecting and recovering from disaster; many International NGOs do not report that less of the previous lesson for developing or prepare to the next. Sometimes, less of inexperienced staff. When donors aid in aftermath disasters, they face a lack of translator and, they don't understand the local culture.

Thirdly actors cannot meet the need for affected people. And local community attitude is very traditional that it is hard to make them accept or adapt to new things. In some cases, the affected family cannot rebuild their own home; a year later disaster aftermath they still stay in camp. When disaster devastates the tourism enterprise zone, entrepreneurs appeal to recovery tourism enterprises.

In brief, the obstacles of humanitarian aid can divide into two terms. The first is from donor itself (culture of organization/institution), less of cooperation with the host

country or community sometimes they need expertise than financial aid, lack of translator person, not realize about the host culture, competitive among donors. The second is recipient countries that lack experience staffs, less of cooperation among actors for sharing information, different criteria and aims.

From obstacles, we can improve by using a network governance concept because network governance is appropriate for policy level and operational level. In disaster management relevant to both level, policy level of policy formulators has to formulate and set operational in network form for all phases of disaster management. In operational level, working as a network form can enhance the capacity of operators by sharing experts, staff, skills, and devices.

The characteristic of network form can be easy to connect the various actors from different sector in domestic and global level. Actors in network operate by cooperating in horizontally structure that led rapid cooperation than hierarchy structure. Moreover, actors can connect their own network and newcomer quicker. However, the network need hub actors for being cooperator of a sub network. Working in network form can share capacity of actor to strengthening disaster relief. The network in disaster management can divide into two types: formal and incident cases. The formal type, it occurred before disaster occurrence, it may have formal cooperation for supporting resources in disaster events. Another type, the incident case is temporary cooperation during disaster events by requiring actors to their networks, or from new actors to the existing network. Both types can lead better service in an emergency case; however, remain the network for long-term is the most importance.

6   Conclusion

The main obstacle in humanitarian aid in a natural disaster is a management problem, especially in cooperation terms. This article presents the result of analysis and proposes a solution by using public administration concepts that focus on network governance in all processes of disaster management. Network management forms can pull the capacity of an organization to others. The network is easy for management because it seems like an extension in a horizontal structure that focuses on cooperation rather than command. Also, the network is easy to connect with the newcomer. It can reduce costs, save time, and budgeting.

Authors' Contributions.   The author collected and selected relevant articles, analysed, and wrote the manuscript.

References

1. UNDP. (2007). Links between natural disasters, humanitarian assistance and disaster risk reduction: A critical perspective. *Human Development Report* (pp. 1–36). http://origin-hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2007-2008/papers/Seck_Papa.pdf

2. Xu, J., & Lu, Y. (2013). A comparative study on the national counterpart aid model for post-disaster recovery and reconstruction. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal, 22*(1), 75–93. https://doi.org/10.1108/09653561311301998

3. Telford, J., & Cosgrave, J. (2007). The international humanitarian system and the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami. *Disasters, 31*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2007.00337

4. Williams, H. R. (2009). Response to the 2004 Tsunami: An international perspective. In J. Steets & D. S. Hamilton (Eds.) *Humanitarian assistance: Improving U.S.-European Cooperation* (pp. 401–412). Center for Transatlantic Relations, The Johns Hopkins University/Global Public Policy Institute.

5. Proulx, K. E., Hager, M. A., & Klein, K. C. (2014). Models of collaboration between nonprofit organizations. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 63*(6), 746–765. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-06-2013-0121

6. Global Humanitarian Assistance. (2017). *Global humanitarian assistance report 2017, Development initiative.* Bristol. http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/GHA-Report-2017-Full-report.pdf

7. U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff and Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2014). Foreign Humanitarian Assistance. *Joint Publication 3-29*, (Jt. Publ. 3-29), p. Chapter 2-1.

8. Agranoff, R. (2007). *Managing within networks: Adding value to public organizations.* Georgetown University Press.

9. Jorgensen, & Beck, T. (1993) *'Modes of governance and administrative change' in modern governance.* Sage.

10. Stivers, C. (1994). The listening bureaucrat: Responsiveness in public administration. *Journal of Public Administration Review, 54*(4), 364–369.

11. Saltzein, G. H. (1992). Bureaucratic responsiveness: Conceptual issues and current research. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 2*(1), 63–88.

12. Moynihan, D. P. (2007) *From forest fires to Hurricane Katrina: Case studies of incident command systems.* IBM Center for the Business of Government.

13. Molin, M. D., & Masella, C. (2015). Networks in policy, management and governance: A comparative literature review to stimulate future research avenues. *Journal of Management & Governance, 20*(4), 823–849. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-015-9329-x

14. Sydow, J., Van Well, B., & Windeler, A. (1998). Networked network: Financial service networks in the context of their industry. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 27*(4), 47–75.

15. Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither market and the social character of economic exchange. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 295–336.

16. Steinkamp, A. (2013). Network governance: Governance models of international networks of cultural cooperation (July, pp. 1–86). http://www.cdcccd.org/IMG/pdf/networkgovernance_Thesis_Steinkamp.pdf

17. Scheper, E., Parakrama, A., & Patel, S. (2006) *Impact of the tsunami response on local and national capacities, TEC - Tsunami Evaluation Coalition.*

18. Valo, T. (2015). *Building community resilience from post-disaster recovery a case study from the Philippines,* 64.

19. Mulligan, M., & Shaw, J. (2007). What the world can learn from Sri Lanka's post-tsunami experiences. *International Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies, 3*(2), 65–91. http://www.usm.my/ijaps/articles/3Mulligan(65-91)1.pdf

20. Jauregui, C., et al. (2011). International disaster response. *Social Issue Report*, (June, pp. 1–7). https://doi.org/10.1017/s1049023x12000313
21. Yarrow, R. (2005). The tsunami and its aftermath. *Veterinary Record, 156*(21), 687.
22. Johnson, C. (2006). Lessons from the epicenter. *Alternatives Journal, 32*(2), 22–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)05006-6
23. Moe, T. L., & Pathranarakul, P. (2006). An integrated approach to natural disaster management. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal, 15*(3), 396–413. https://doi.org/10.1108/09653560610669882
24. United State Agency and International Development. (2015). *USAID Helps Haitian Families Return Home After Hurricane Matthew*.
25. CHS Alliance, G. U., & The S. P. (2014). *Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability*. CHS Alliance, Group URD and the Sphere Project. Retrieved February 28, 2019, from www.corehumanitarianstandard.org
26. Aijazi, O. (2015). Social repair and structural inequity: Implications for disaster recovery practice. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment, 6*(4), 454–467. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJDRBE-08-2013-0033
27. Barber, R. (2012). *Responding to emergencies in Southeast Asia: Can we do better? A Review of the Humanitarian Response to the 2011 Thailand and Cambodia Floods*. Melbourne.
28. Haiyan, F. T. (2015). An Integrated Approach to Assistance in the Philippines.
29. Lum, T., & Margesson, R. (2014): Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda): U.S. and international response to Philippines disaster. *Current Politics and Economics of South, Southeastern, and Central Asia, 23*(2), 200–246.
30. Srisirirojanakorn, N., et al. (2022). *Thailand disaster management reference handbook*. Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance. Retrieved February 18, 2020, from https://www.cfe-dmha.org