



RESEARCH ARTICLE

REVISED Entropy in the 'entrepot': Examining the challenges of relief supply chains during COVID-19 pandemic relief item distribution operation-2020 in Uganda [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]

Wilbroad Aryatwijuka ¹, Ruth Nyiramahoro¹, Asaph Katarangi², Frederick Nsambu Kijjambu³, Aloysius Rukundo ⁴

¹Department of Procurement and Marketing, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

²Human Resource Management, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

³Department of Accounting and Finance, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

⁴Department of Educational Foundations and Psychology, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

V2 First published: 20 Oct 2022, 4:36
<https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.14694.1>
 Latest published: 12 May 2023, 4:36
<https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.14694.2>

Abstract

Background: The study focuses on the challenges encountered during the distribution of food and face-mask items during the first COVID-19 lock-down by various relief supply chain actors.

Methods: Data were collected from forty (40) relief actors through online (via zoom and telephones) and face-to-face interviews, between January 2021 to March 2021. Data was coded based on per-determined themes after which it was further processed using Atlas ti. v7.57 to generate patterns.

Results: The study established challenges related to needs identification, procurement, warehousing, transportation, handling, beneficiary verification, and last-mile distribution. Additionally, the media and politics coupled with the emergence of new actors and governance issues were part of the challenges identified.







Conclusions: The identified challenges were internal and external to the relief supply chain; hence actors could have control over some while others were beyond their control. The findings could inform practitioners and policymakers on what challenges are likely to affect their operations, especially during a pandemic, and design appropriate coping mechanisms

Keywords


Relief supply chains, relief distribution, humanitarian operations, epidemic, lockdown, relief storage facility, relief aid.

Open Peer Review


Approval Status  

	1	2
version 2		
(revision)		
12 May 2023		
version 1		
20 Oct 2022		

1. **Arvind Upadhyay** , University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway

2. **Matthew Kalubanga** , Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.



This article is included in the [Healthier Lives gateway](#).

Corresponding author: Aloysius Rukundo (rukundoaloy@yahoo.com)

Author roles: **Aryatwijuka W:** Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Writing – Original Draft Preparation; **Nyiramahoro R:** Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Methodology; **Katarangi A:** Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Writing – Original Draft Preparation; **Nsambu Kijjambu F:** Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Resources; **Rukundo A:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: The author(s) declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.

Copyright: © 2023 Aryatwijuka W *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Aryatwijuka W, Nyiramahoro R, Katarangi A *et al.* **Entropy in the 'entrepot': Examining the challenges of relief supply chains during COVID-19 pandemic relief item distribution operation-2020 in Uganda [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]** Emerald Open Research 2023, 4:36 <https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.14694.2>

First published: 20 Oct 2022, 4:36 <https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.14694.1>

REVISED Amendments from Version 1

The article received major revisions after the peer review process. Changes were made in the abstract, theoretical review, literature review, and methodology. We hope the new changes will be more informative and will improve the article's readability.

Any further responses from the reviewers can be found at the end of the article

Introduction

Relief supply during hard times like the COVID-19 pandemic is one of the key elements among governments in developing economies. One of the obstacles encountered is the navigation of the relief supply chain before reaching the final beneficiaries. To that end, supply chain management plays an important role in ensuring the success of any relief operation, as it coordinates the planning, procurement, and distribution of relief items from the source to the final consumer (de Moura *et al.*, 2020).

The relief supply chain management is the “process of planning, managing, implementing and controlling the efficiency, flow and storage of relief items. It is as well related to information and funds, from the point of origin (suppliers and donors) to the point of consumption, to meet the end beneficiary’s requirements” (Maghsoudi & Moshtari, 2021). Accordingly, relief supply chains, in general, account for up to 80% of the total humanitarian budget (Van Wassenhove, 2006), covering activities like needs assessment, resource mobilization, procurement, transportation, warehousing, and distribution to the final consumer (Van Wassenhove, 2006). Previous literature on relief supply chain operations has documented a wide range of practical challenges that inhibit the efficiency of relief supply chain operations. These challenges are not only aggravated by deficiencies in personnel supply chain competencies such as training and experience, but also other bottlenecks such as inadequate funding, poor infrastructure, and the complexity of the disasters for which the relief is meant (Balcik *et al.*, 2008; Balcik *et al.*, 2010; Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020; Kovacs & Tatham, 2009; Sandwell, 2011). Additionally, the environment in which the relief supply chain operates is characterized by increased media scrutiny and high levels of uncertainty. Hence, the difficulty of demand forecasting, and multiple stakeholders with varying needs (Kovacs & Tatham, 2009; Maghsoudi & Moshtari, 2021; Sandwell, 2011; Van Wassenhove, 2006).

Whereas previous studies have examined the challenges of relief supply chains, there are persistent natural and manmade disasters world over whose relief response has always registered challenges (Maghsoudi & Moshtari, 2021; Mwangangi, 2016). Response to the COVID-19 pandemic is not an exemption leading to the key research question of this study is seeking to address; what challenges affected the COVID-19 relief operations in 2020 Uganda? This study explores the challenges related to needs identification; during procurement, transportation, and warehousing; distribution to the beneficiary; the

growing influence and use of social media; the laws, politics, and governance and the emergence of new actors. That were encountered in the chain of supplying relief items during the COVID-19 response operation in 2020 in Uganda. Moreover, relief supply chain operations are unique as they vary depending on location, intensity, timing, and context, as is the case in the current study considering a pandemic of great magnitude (Kovacs & Moshtari, 2019; Upadhyay *et al.*, 2022). The current study adds to existing literature and furthers the understanding of the challenges along the supply chain that arise during operations conducted during a pandemic using the theory of change.

This study is inspired by the advent of events in March 2020, following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. Following the outbreak, the Ugandan government ordered a nationwide lockdown (Ahimbisibwe, 2020). Meanwhile, the government set up a ministerial team headed by the prime minister to champion COVID-19 response efforts with the support of both national and international relief aid organizations (Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020).

After its institution, the relief supply team constituted measures concerning the distribution of food supplies mainly to the vulnerable groups in the metropolitan Kampala area (Shi, 2020). The relief program was designed to distribute mainly maize flour and beans to specific vulnerable groups. Further, sugar and powdered milk were a special ways to be distributed to breastfeeding mothers. Given the need to maintain standard operating procedures associated with the pandemic, the food distribution operations were conducted in a house-to-house and door-to-door technique (Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020). Moreover, another program was put in place regarding the distribution of 30 million face masks to adult citizens, especially vulnerable groups (Kajoba, 2020). However, despite the efforts by the stakeholders to supply relief items, the operation registered multiple challenges as the items were not reaching the intended destination at the right time, quality, quantity, cost, and most importantly to the right beneficiaries (Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020). There were reported delays and worst of all some items were reported to be unfit for human consumption and use respectively, an indication of supply chain inefficiency (Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020), yet timely delivery of the items required an efficient supply chain.

Literature and theoretical review

The purpose of any relief supply initiative points to the alleviation of the suffering persons of a country may experience, ensuring supply network delivers the right relief items, at the right time, right quantities, delivered at the right place in the right condition at the right cost (Bölsche *et al.*, 2013; Maghsoudi & Moshtari, 2021). The relief supply chain, like in the business sector, aims at meeting the needs of the final consumer who is at the tail end of the downstream of the network (Jraisat *et al.*, 2022; Mwangangi, 2016). So, before the commencement of any relief operation, actors should forecast the demand, procure, transport, store, and distribute the items over the last mile to the intended beneficiaries (Tatham *et al.*, 2017; Upadhyay *et al.*, 2022).

When forecasting is underlooked, the supply chain becomes liable to challenges at all its stages. The challenges at the needs assessment include needs complexity, rapid needs assessment that is prone to errors, volatility of demand, and limited or no coordination among the various stakeholders (Balcik *et al.*, 2008; Tatham *et al.*, 2017). Further, assessing the needs is made more difficult by other parameters like the location, since some disaster-struck areas are at times inaccessible due to improper infrastructure. Moreover, unregulated movements by refugees are synonymous with disaster situations, hence a challenge to the proper functioning of the relief supply chain (L'Hermitte *et al.*, 2015). Unlike in the business sector where logisticians easily capture consumer needs, relief operations encounter diversity in terms of beneficiaries, especially in terms of origin, culture, and language. That makes the distribution process more difficult to accurately capture the needs of the intended beneficiaries (Kovacs & Spens, 2011; Tatham *et al.*, 2017).

The challenges at procurement not only cover acquisition but also transportation and storage. Some of the problems at this stage include unethical behavior, limited product availability, shortened lead times, limited financial resources, limited supply chain expertise, little storage space, limited information on cost of acquisition, restrictions ranging from legal, tariffs, and trade (Baporikar & Shangheta, 2018; L'Hermitte *et al.*, 2015; Makali, 2015; Tatham *et al.*, 2017). More complexity arises due to limited access to credible supplies that can meet the tight timelines (Balcik *et al.*, 2008). Additionally, transporting and storing the procured goods has been a nightmare, as the poor infrastructure makes the operations more challenging (Baporikar & Shangheta, 2018). Procurement and storage of items become further challenging, as donor fatigue increases (Balcik *et al.*, 2008; Sandwell, 2011).

Of late, there has been a growing challenge of unethical behavior, where operational actors falsified the cost of items during procurement, transportation, storage, and, worse still, inflating beneficiary numbers, which further poses a challenge to relief supply chains (Makali, 2015; Maria *et al.*, 2018). Coupled with the above challenges is the diversity of the various stakeholders from government agencies to non-government agencies all of which have got different structures, objectives, policies, and sources of funding. All of these complicate procurement and storage activities and pose a challenge to relief supply chains (Balcik *et al.*, 2010; Makepeace *et al.*, 2017). Relatedly, the different agencies have different standards, guidelines, and staffing capabilities. That makes coordination, communication, and organization of relief supply chain activities difficult (Makepeace *et al.*, 2017; Moshtari & Gonçalves, 2017).

The supply chain during distribution could be affected by difficulty in accessing the relief recipients, lack of security for last-mile deliveries, cross-border travel restrictions, strict delivery timelines, and difficulty in the verification of beneficiaries (Balcik *et al.*, 2008; Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020; Maghfiroh & Hanaoka, 2017). Thus, distribution is a very complex phase as it epitomizes all relief supply chain efforts. For instance, the

supply faces disruptions, ranging from difficulty in accessing the right beneficiaries, security concerns, and the capacity of the actors (Maghsoudi & Moshtari, 2021). There could also be concerns regarding nonexistent road infrastructure, changes in supply routes caused by movements by the beneficiaries, and, most importantly, the border restrictions against supplies from different locations, countries, and donors who at times make donations in kind (Maghfiroh & Hanaoka, 2017).

Besides the challenges above, other external issues affect relief operations. Mainly, the issues are non-logistical, although they also influence relief operations. They include the increasing influence of social media, politics, delays in legislation, and the emergence of new actors in relief operations such as philanthropists and celebrities (Kunz & Gold, 2017; Kunz & Reiner, 2016). Regarding the increased influence of social media, relief operations are scrutinized now more than before, since it is not only able to bring to light disasters in real-time but also challenges or failures during operations (Houston *et al.*, 2015; Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020; Wamba *et al.*, 2019). While relief aid organizations have lately embraced social media to reach potential donors, share information with their peers, collect data and disseminate key information to the wider community, it has come at a huge cost (Barnawal, 2014; Leonardi *et al.*, 2013).

The increased connectivity has reduced the productivity of staff as they spend most of the work hours on social media, caused loss of important data, loss of intellectual property, and compromised information security as systems hacks are now routine (Barnawal, 2014; Houston *et al.*, 2015; Leonardi *et al.*, 2013; Wamba *et al.*, 2019). Moreover, social media has proved to propagate misinformation in the 'form of fake news'. That has hurt the majority of the relief aid organizations (Barnawal, 2014). For instance, there was spread false information regarding the quality of supplies, speed of the supply chain, and many other forms of falsehoods during the operation. Such negativity affected the image, speed, and success of the relief operation (Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020). While organizations continue to use social media, there is an inconclusive debate as to whether social media should be embraced as an official tool of communication in relief supply chains.

The increased presence of other actors, such as celebrities and stand-alone philanthropists has largely been amplified by social media (Kapucu, 2016; Wamba *et al.*, 2019). For instance, during the Haiti 2010 earthquake and the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, the world witnessed many actors coming on board alongside the traditional humanitarian agencies (Besiou *et al.*, 2013). Similarly, during the relief operation in Uganda, there were many philanthropists, social media influencers, celebrities and other actors who participated although they were not coordinating with both government and non-government agencies hence causing duplication of effort. Although scholars like Maghsoudi & Moshtari (2021) and Alexander (2015) have documented the role of these actors, there is limited literature on how these new players coordinate with the mainstream

relief aid organizations to manage relief supply chains during a pandemic.

More among the non-logistical challenges is the role of politics, laws, and governance during relief operations in a pandemic. Whereas relief operations have been in existence for years, few governments world over have not enacted laws to address the various legal grey areas during relief operations (Maghsoudi & Moshtari, 2021). Moreover, challenging rules and regulations are to relief operations in some countries (Kunz & Gold, 2017; Kunz & Reiner (2016). Considering that laws impact relief operations as they regulate the operation of national and international aid agencies, how they become a challenge during operating relief supply chains during a pandemic could be further inspected.

The sources considered point to the way relief supply dynamics change, as new disasters dictate. So, this study was irradiated by the change theory. The theory of change (ToC) draws its origins from the principle of management by objectives as a management philosophy advanced by Peter Drucker in the mid-1990s and popularized by Chen, Rossi, Patton, Clark, and Weiss (Funnell & Rogers, 2011). The theory of change is often used as a support tool for decision-making when carrying out interventions by designing and implementing programs aimed at creating social change (Browne, 2013). The theory has been used widely by organizations carrying out relief operations as it provides a framework for analyzing how planned activities, interventions will yield the desired outcomes (Biggs *et al.*, 2017).

Various relief aid organizations use the theory of change to carry out monitoring and evaluation and hence involve the intended beneficiaries to map out the required inputs to get the desired outcomes (Browne, 2013; Piggot-Irvine *et al.*, 2015). Currently, it has become desirable for most donors who insist on the use of the theory of change as its application at the planning phase increases the chances of success of the intended intervention (James, 2011; Muhammad *et al.*, 2022; Upadhyay *et al.*, 2022).

The theory posits that there should be a participatory approach in program design especially in capturing beneficiary needs from the start, based on evidence, consultation, and continuous learning (Biggs *et al.*, 2017; Valters, 2014). The theory has in the recent past risen to prominence as many scholars are advocating for its use in designing and implementing relief operations interventions (Yates *et al.*, 2020). Despite its apparent growth in usage, its proponents have registered varied results. From the COVID-19 response 2020 in Uganda, the challenges witnessed can partly explain to some extent the lack of stakeholder participation from the design of the program, from the phase of needs identification. That anomaly followed the entire operation, hence makes the theory applicable to the current study

Methods

Ethical statement

Ethical approval was sought and granted by appropriate institutions before conducting the study.

In the first instance, Mbarara University Institutional Research Ethics Committee (IREC) approved the study under reference number MUST-2021-110. Further approval was obtained by the National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST) under approval reference number SS1037ES. Before data collection, all the study participants were informed that the study was for academic purposes only. Written informed consent was subsequently sought and obtained from the participants, in accordance with the protocol approved by Mbarara University Institutional Research Ethics Committee. Every participant signed the official IREC consent form before partaking in the study.

Design, Population and sampling

The study adopted a case study, to enable the collection of detailed and rich data (Rashid *et al.*, 2019) in natural settings (Yin, 2009; Yin, 2017). The study interviewed 40 key stakeholders involved in the COVID-19 pandemic relief item distribution in 2020 in Uganda who were purposively selected. These included a multi-sectorial team involving 8 Government agencies; 15 international and 5 national humanitarian organizations, 3 Academia and Religious groups, 2 Social media influencers, and Celebrities and Mainstream media houses. Besides the inter-ministerial team that comprised government agencies which were the lead responders in the relief operation, there were celebrities who actively participated by mobilizing relief items and distributing them to their fans. Relief aid organizations both local and international mobilized resources and participated in the distribution as one of their core mandates. Social media influencers who like celebrities mobilized and distributed relief items to their fans. The mainstream media houses were involved to the extent of providing 360-degree coverage of the relief operation. The religious organizations were selected because they had also been actively involved in mobilizing and distributing relief support to their followers. Academicians were selected because they were in the position to examine the operation from a technical standpoint by highlighting what ought to have been. The interviewees were purposively identified through working documents of team members registered and approved by the office of the Prime Minister (OPM), which was the lead government department in charge of the COVID-19 relief operation 2020. After identifying the respondents who were involved in supply chain activities, they were contacted by phone and email using the information obtained from the OPM. Appointments were made for either physical or online interviews, based on the preference of the participant. The majority were got from the distribution section as the distributors directly interfaced with intended beneficiaries, thus more familiar with operational challenges than the rest of the groups. Members of the relief team that were involved in issues other than relief operations were excluded. Those involved in social work such as counseling and oversight were not considered for participation in the study. These were considered as not having firsthand information about the operational challenges.

Data collection

Data were collected using a semi-structured interview guide in English, as all interviewees could communicate in English. The interview guide was constructed by the research team of

this study, borrowing ideas from Maghsoudi & Moshtari (2021). The instrument was piloted on a group of five participants from the OPM that had participated in the “Bududa mudslide” operation in 2019. The instrument has been published accordingly (Rukundo & Aryatwijuka, 2022). These individuals were chosen because they had participated in the distribution of relief items in a similar operation in response to a mudslide that had occurred in Eastern Uganda. Participants in the pilot study were as well recruited using information from the OPM and contacted by telephone for interviews. Three were interviewed physically and two online. Following the responses from the pilot, some of the initial items in the interview guide were revised accordingly. For instance, an item that initially read: ‘Describe the role of your organization in delivering relief supplies to intended beneficiaries’ was modified to ‘What is the role of your organization in delivering relief supplies to intended beneficiaries’ to make the item precise and easier to interpret by the participant. After piloting the instrument was deemed suitable for the study as it met the conditions of validity and reliability as guided by Creswell (2014). The guide captured information related to supply chain activities, logistic and non-logistic challenges, and the overall performance of the operation. An example of a typical interview question is: ‘Describe whether your organization faced challenges in its operations’. In observance of the COVID 19- pandemic restrictions, interviews were conducted in a variety of ways. First, we did 20 face-to-face interviews with participants who offered to be interviewed from their workplace spaces, since they were essential workers and were allowed to access offices during the COVID-19 lockdown. So, they were physically accessible in their offices. They were interviewed in their respective offices upon appointment. Second, we used Zoom and telephone with 20 participants that were not physically accessible. Of the 20 online, 15 were telephone and five were on Zoom. Interviews were conducted until saturation was reached at the 40th interview. All interviews were conducted in English, as all participants were conversant and comfortable with it. Interviews took place from January 2021 to March 2021. The average duration of the interviews was 60 minutes. Interviews were captured manually and electronically, using a notebook and voice recorder respectively. The personal information of the participants is anonymized. However, other non-identifiable details such as gender, level of education, experience, category of the interviewee, and type of the interview were captured (see Table 1). Interviews were transcribed by reading through the texts and listening to the recordings several times. Transcription was done using Microsoft Word and then fed into Atlas ti. v7.57 software for analysis.

Data processing and analysis

Data were coded and analyzed using a computer program, Atlas ti. v7.57 (<https://atlasti.com/>). A similar software, Nvivo version 20.2.0.426 freely accessible at <https://download.freedownloadmanager.org/Windows-PC/QSR-NVivo/FREE.html> could be used to analyze the data. Data were categorized to identify challenges, using an open coding procedure (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Further, data were reduced

into categories through coding of sections that ranged from a few to many words. Reduction of the data to manageable parts was done through grouping of similar ideas together and removing redundant statements. Care was taken to code only the challenges along the supply chain that affected the relief operation, avoiding and eliminating the personal feelings of the respondents. An iterative process was undertaken during the coding process, to link the present study findings with literature. Tables were generated in Microsoft Word. Transcripts were generated and read through several times while taking notes with codes relating to particular themes. The codes were connected to conceptual themes that were formed after identifying the patterns within the dataset during the process of data analysis. Data were grouped through identification of similar themes and texts. Thereafter, the themes generated were connected to the supply chain challenges in line with the literature. To reduce bias, three researchers separately analyzed the data. Each of the researchers used a consistent coding frame to realize intercoder reliability (O’Connor & Joffe, 2020). To reach a consensus, the researchers compared their coding and discussed the divergences and overlaps. The final codes were later connected to the categorical and conceptual links. The researchers shared the preliminary findings with 15 of the study participants and other stakeholders in a Zoom conference organized in May 2021. Participants for the conference were selected in consideration of the representation of the categories of needs identification, procurement, storage, transportation, and distribution. Although each of the above categories was represented, participation in the conference of each of the categories was not proportionate due to logistical and the COVID-19 lockdown challenges. Conferencing with some of the participants was for obtaining their feedback and verification of the results. Further, sharing the findings was to ensure trustworthiness, authenticity, and reliability and as a means of disseminating the study findings to the concerned stakeholders. To that end, the feedback from the conference was used to fine-tune the findings by identifying any omissions or misunderstandings. Corrections were made only in the bio-data section, such as correction of the participants’ sex and category of the participants’ job designation. There was no need for corrections in the results of the themes identified during analysis.

Results

This study examined challenges encountered during the distribution of relief supply items, focusing on relief food and face mask operations during the pandemic. There was a total of 40 interviews conducted (30 male and 10 female participants), with 20 face-to-face, 15 over the telephone, and five over Zoom (Table 1). Participants in this study were anonymized by numbering. For instance, the first participant to be interviewed was labeled ‘interviewee 1’, until ‘interviewee 40’. Dates when the interviews were conducted are included in reporting of quotes, for clarity purposes. As seen in Table 2, the challenges experienced during the response operation were located in the entire relief supply chain from needs assessment, procurement, warehousing, and distribution to the final consumer (last mile).

Table 1. Presentation of respondents' demographic characteristics.

Item	Type	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	30	75
	Female	10	25
Level of education	Certificate	3	7.5
	Diploma	5	12.5
	Degree	25	62.5
Years of service	Postgraduate	7	17.5
	0-1 year	5	12.5
	2-5 years	10	25
Respondent category	Above 5 years	25	62.5
	Government agencies	8	20
	International humanitarian organizations	15	37.5
	National humanitarian organizations	5	12.5
	Academia	3	7.5
	Religious groups	3	7.5
	Social media influencers	2	5
Interview type	Celebrities	2	5
	Mainstream media houses	2	5
	Face-to-face	20	50
	Online	20	50

Source: Primary data.

Table 2. Presentation of data according to the themes and subthemes identified in the study.

Theme	Sub theme	Subtheme pervasiveness	Compelling quotes
Challenges at needs identification	Wrong beneficiary numbers, corruption, lack of coordination	High number of responses/ Majority reflect this theme	01
Challenges in procurement, transportation, and ware housing.	Violation of procurement guidelines, inaccessibility of beneficiaries, lack of storage facilities.	High number of responses / All reflect this theme.	02
Challenges at distribution to the beneficiary	Wrong beneficiary numbers, duplication of effort, poorly planned homesteads, hostile weather, varying beneficiary expectations	High number of responses/ Majority reflect this theme	03
Challenges with the growing influence and use of social media	Spreading false information	High number of responses/ Majority reflect this theme	02
Challenges with the laws, politics and governance.	Weak laws, unregulated actors, political interference	High number of responses/ Majority reflect this theme	01
Challenges with emergence of new actors	Lack of structures to manage supply, duplication of effort, political interference	Small number of responses/ all reflect this theme	None

Source: Primary data.

Challenges at the needs assessment level

The challenges at this stage stemmed from a lack of up-to-date records regarding the number of persons per village, parish, sub-county, district, or country. The previous national housing and population census results were expired, as they were conducted in 2014. Consequently, the relief operation was working with outdated records. Moreover, the uniqueness of the 2020 relief operation posed a challenge in assessing the needs since it targeted the urban poor, sick, breastfeeding mothers, elderly, and small business operators in the metropolitan area. So, determining the rightful beneficiaries was complex, since the middle class demanded support as well.

As respondent 3 on 5th January 2021, observed that, the former working-class also became the “urban poor” as the lockdown continued and hence required relief items. Other participants observed that corruption tendencies were experienced at this level, as enumerators had reported ghost residents. That resulted in a mismatch -delivery of redundant relief items in places with less demand and fewer items in areas with high demand.

Another challenge at this level was the failure to match the lifestyle, culture, demographic, ethnic grouping, and geographical locations of the intended beneficiaries with the planned supplies. According to one of the interviewees, “whereas the plan was to give 3kg of posho and 2 kg of beans per individual, there was no plan for the elderly or the young who are not breastfeeding and are unable to consume posho and beans”. (Respondent 6, 10th January 2021)

Another respondent underscored the lack of coordination between the actors involved in the operation as each group was targeting its beneficiaries. The respondent said “the church is only targeting its members leaving out others in need but not part of the church establishment.” (Respondent 29, 1st March, 2021). Moreover, whereas government agencies were targeting all groups identified by the national task force, other actors had their beneficiaries of interest. That made the process of needs assessment more complex. Respondents further noted lack of trust among the actors as a challenge to proper needs assessment as actors appeared to be competing amongst themselves out of pressure from the media.

Since the relief response was to a pandemic whose lockdown lasted longer than anticipated, beneficiary needs kept changing as the categories of the vulnerable persons kept increasing. One of the respondents noted that as the lockdown stretched to months, more people lost their jobs, and qualified for food relief. Also, as the COVID-19 infected cases increased, the pressure and demand for masks increased. That further complicating the needs assessment exercise.

Procurement, transportation, and warehousing challenges

Whereas humanitarian agencies have the infrastructure in place to conduct procurement during normal relief operations, storage and distribution were a big problem during the pandemic. The epicenter of the relief operations in Kampala city lacked

basic storage facilities for supplies. So, agencies were largely adapting just-in-time as items would be procured in an *ad-hoc* manner for delivery with little storage. During the relief operation, the national task force commissioned a donation drive for food, masks, and money. The majority of the supplies were procured under the emergency category thereby not following the well-established procurement guidelines. Failure to follow procurement guidelines resulted in inflated prices, procurement of food that was not fit for human consumption, delayed delivery of food and face masks as some of the companies contracted could not supply the required quantities at the right time. For instance, one of the respondents said: “Some of the beans supplied had stones while the posho was adulterated”. Another participant said. “We have been waiting for food for the last two months, and as for masks I do not have hope that they will ever be delivered”. (Respondent 7, 25th January 2021)

Transportation of supplies was also identified as a problem. It was difficult to deliver relief items to some areas as they were inaccessible due to poorly organized housing. That further reduced the speed of distribution of relief items. In the city suburbs, the transportation challenge was exacerbated by the poor or at times nonexistent roads especially during the distribution of the items. One respondent said: “Our teams are forced to carry food items on their heads and this is labor-intensive as some places are inaccessible”. (Respondent 8, 27th January 2021)

There was a challenge of diversion or theft of supplies. As the procurement exercise was conducted as an emergency with little regard to well-established procurement procedures, there were many cases of ‘air supply’ where suppliers falsified the quantities supplied to be paid for what they never supplied. In other cases, some actors connived amongst themselves and diverted or stole the supplies and put them back to the market for resale. That was largely attributed to a lack of adequate storage facilities. One of the respondents said: “Part of the food is issued and then it disappears along the way without reaching the intended beneficiaries and goes back to the market”. (Respondent 10, 30th January 2021)

Challenges with distribution to the final consumer

This stage of the relief supply chain requires efficient infrastructure and robust information systems. According to the study participants, several challenges were witnessed at this stage. First of all, as earlier seen at the level of needs assessment, there was a lack of clarity on how many beneficiaries were out there to be served. Other challenges caused by the pandemic were the maintenance of social distancing, avoiding crowding, and maintenance of all the protocols as per the guidance by the ministry of health. In observance of the COVID-19 standard operating procedures, the mode of delivery was house-to-house, and this caused the last-mile delivery complex. This is very different from other operations where the beneficiaries gather in one distribution center and receive all the supplies.

Among the many challenges was the duplication of effort. For instance, some beneficiaries received relief items from

government agencies, humanitarian agencies, religious organizations, philanthropists, and politicians, while in some areas no supplies were received at all. Another scenario was where the political influence came into relief operations as one respondent observed that: “Some areas which are represented by politicians who subscribe to the ruling government’s ideology were served first while those areas which are pro-opposition were left out”. (Respondent 30, 15th March 2021)

There was also difficulty reaching the target beneficiaries. This was caused by the unplanned housing units were another challenge with a house-to-house form of relief operation. Whereas it was presumed that all people stay in houses, some urban dwellers have no permanent places of residence. One respondent said: “We thought we would find people in their homes; however, some stay in pipes, under the trees, and others has no permanent address and this is challenging to reach out to them”. (Respondent 9, 30th January 2021)

There was an element of “harsh weather conditions”. During the relief operation, the months of March up to June registered heavy rains and this made last-mile distribution more cumbersome. For instance, in central Uganda, the months of March to June received rain almost daily. This was a big challenge, especially where the mode of distribution was house-to-house.

Another challenge was managing contrasting stakeholder expectations. It should be noted that there were many actors involved in the operation, whereas the standard by government agencies was 3kg of posho and 2kg of beans and homemade cloth masks. While non-governmental agencies distributed as many as 10kg of posho and 5 kg of beans per individual. Other actors were distributing high-quality products like rice, cooking oil, powdered milk, and medical grade masks. One respondent said: “Imagine carrying 3kg of posho and 2 kg of beans when other groups are distributing rice in the same neighborhood?” (Respondent 39, 28th March 2021)

Non-logistical challenges during the relief operation

There are challenges that one cannot directly attribute to the proper functioning of a relief supply chain but can influence its functioning. For instance, there are challenges like the growing influence of social media, the emergence of new actors in relief operations, and the power of politics manifested in existing national laws and regulations. It should be noted that operations during a pandemic are very unique and complex and so the academic world needs to put a keen interest in such operations.

The growing influence and use of social media

During the distribution of relief items, social media platforms like WhatsApp, Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook played a major role in spreading not only key operational information but also falsehoods. Social media helped in mobilizing local donations, alerting nationals on the progress of the relief operations, and disseminating vital and timely information about the pandemic. Actors were able to reach out to those in

need and at times this would save a life. As said by one of the respondents, “social media was able to bring out the challenges of the relief operation”. Another respondent said: “Had it not been social media we would not be able to know how food and face masks intended for citizens were being diverted by those in charge for personal gain”. (Respondent 18, 6th February 2021). Information on the progress of the operation would come in real-time and this was a good platform to get beneficiary feedback.

Social media was at the forefront of bringing to light inefficiencies like delays, distribution of food unfit for human consumption, and inflated commodity prices. This would in most cases prompt immediate government response aimed at improving the relief operation. This was witnessed when after reports of inflated prices of food, officials from the office of the prime minister were within 24 hours of social media reports interdicted to pave way for an investigation.

However social media also had its negative side. For instance, persistent false news spread on social media where photos of expired food on the internet would be spread to alarm the country that that is what was being distributed during the relief operation. Additionally, persistent false reports that government agencies were giving relief supplies to only its supporters. These were some of the excesses of social media that affected the relief supply chain during the relief operation. One of the respondents said that: “because of social media, some donors have failed to honor their pledged items with a perception that it will all be misused”. (Respondent 19, 7th February 2021)

Influence of laws, politics, and governance during the operation

In the study, it was observed that no specific laws were in place to regulate the relief operations more so during a pandemic. The operation was mainly guided by political proclamations. Moreover, the pandemic struck towards the political season as the country was preparing for general elections. Hence, enacting supportive laws to facilitate relief operations during and after the pandemic was lacking. This hindered the smooth coordination among actors, roles were ambiguous in the operation, and there was duplication of effort with several actors responding to the same groups of beneficiaries while others were left out. Additionally, actors like religious groups were mainly focusing on beneficiaries that subscribe to them while celebrities and philanthropists focused on reaching beneficiaries whose plight will be publicized by media.

Furthermore, while there was a national task force championing the donation drives whose activities were regulated, other stakeholders like philanthropists, celebrities, and religious groups had their campaigns with no guidelines regulating their fundraising programs. This posed a threat to transparency and accountability in the absence of a legal framework to streamline such a campaign. One of the respondents noted that: “When donations are given to government agencies, there are known

procedures on how they are accounted for, however, there are no guidelines on donations to philanthropists, religious bodies or individuals". (Respondent 24, 11th February 2021)

Relatedly, the difference in the governance structure of the stakeholders was a challenge in coordination as each agency had its ownership, goals, targets, objectives, and methods of work. Hence, critical information on needs, locations, and feedback from the target beneficiaries was not shared across the board to have a coordinated and robust response. Also considering that there was a lockdown, with movements restricted, posed a challenge to relief operations especially for non-government agencies. The requirement to seek permission to move from one point to another was restrictive to the proper functioning of the supply chain. Hence, lockdown restrictions hindered resource mobilization, relief data collection, and distribution of relief supplies.

Generally, respondents reported failure by the government to regulate key functions of the operation like information on needs of the beneficiaries, quality of the supplies, coverage of the operations by different actors, resource mobilization, and accountability mechanisms. Instead, the government regulated and restricted movement and watched on as politics interfered with the relief operations at the expense of beneficiaries who needed relief support.

The emergence of new actors

During the COVID-19 pandemic relief operation in 2020, there were many activists, politicians, athletes, and celebrities who ran parallel relief supply chains. These were limited and at times there was no coordination with the national task force. These actors were mainly driven by the media as all their efforts were always accompanied by a big media coverage. As earlier observed, given that the country was in a political season, it was a turn for potential candidates in the upcoming elections to show that they care about their people. According to respondents, there were a lot of resources mobilized by these actors from the business community, their supporters, political party sympathizers, and other individuals.

Additionally, given that these actors had no structures to run efficient supply chains, most of their relief supplies in form of food and masks were not delivered to the intended beneficiaries. Some of the items were stolen by intermediaries and self-appointed leaders of beneficiary groups, since such actors lacked coordination with the national task force, relief aid organizations, and religious groups which had staff and structures to operate relief supply chains. Some of the politicians in opposition to the ruling government and celebrities who the state categorized as sympathizers to the opposition had their accounts frozen and relief activities suspended under the disguise that they are likely to spread COVID-19 as they distribute relief supplies. This meant that while this was a genuine cause, it was frustrating as a lot of relief items were collected by politicians and celebrities but were never allowed by security forces to be distributed to the intended beneficiaries.

While new actors came on board to support efforts of government and actor stakeholders to ensure that the vulnerable communities got food and face masks, their success was based on which political side they belonged to or were sympathetic to, and this contributed to more challenges that affected the relief operation.

Discussion

From the data analyzed in the current paper, the following conclusions are drawn. To begin with, the challenges in the COVID-19 pandemic relief operation in Uganda in 2020 are in agreement with studies (Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020; Kovacs & Spens, 2009; Kovacs & Tatham, 2009; Leiras *et al.*, 2014; Maghsoudi & Moshtari, 2021; Sandwell, 2011) and broadens the body of knowledge in relief supply chain literature. The current study identified several issues at the preliminary phase of needs assessment and confirmed that it is at the needs assessment stage that an operation can succeed or fail, in line with existing literature (Balcik *et al.*, 2008; Isabirye & Musasizi, 2020; L'Hermitte *et al.*, 2015; Maghsoudi & Moshtari, 2021; Tatham *et al.*, 2017). For instance, it was discovered that unlike other relief operations and even in the business sector where their less complexity, during a pandemic it is difficult to ascertain the level of demand (Tatham *et al.*, 2017).

With inaccurate forecasts, actors in a relief supply chain during a pandemic are unable to deliver relief supplies at the right cost, speed, quantity, and quality. The absence of up-to-date data of the number of citizens, coupled with the lockdown measures and restrictions during a pandemic which kept changing the economic status of the population from employed to unemployed, middle class to poor, healthy to unhealthy, made the operation more complex. This is in contrast to the change theory which advocates for a participatory approach in needs identification by involving the beneficiaries in need identification.

Furthermore, limited coordination along the relief supply chain especially between government agencies and other stakeholders, infrastructure bottlenecks, and a lockdown restriction due to the pandemic creates challenges for procurement, storage, transportation up to distribution to the intended beneficiaries. These findings are in agreement with reports in previous studies of Maghsoudi & Moshtari (2021), Baporikar & Shangheta (2018), Makepeace *et al.* (2017), Tatham *et al.* (2017), and Balcik *et al.* (2010). Indeed, emergency procurements during a lockdown are a recipe for corruption, selection, and contracting of incompetent supplies which in turn increases lead times, procurement of poor quality of goods, and worse still at unreasonably high prices.

The prolonged lockdown created more complexity and escalated demand for relief supplies. As organizations shut down operations, more people became jobless and joined the category of the urban poor who required relief food. While many stakeholders joined the humanitarian campaign, they could not meet the varied needs of the intended beneficiaries. Amidst

the uncertainty of demand and failure to meet beneficiary needs, there was also a lack of supply chain visibility as various actors along the relief chain were unable to have accurate information on who needs supplies and who does not, largely due to limited coordination among actors.

In addition to the challenges already documented above, our study discovered another category of challenges that affected the COVID-19 pandemic response operation in Uganda. These were non-logistical but affected the relief operation. These challenges include the increased influence and use of social media, the influence of laws, politics, and governance, and the emergence of new actors. While there is limited literature on the aforementioned factors and how they impact relief operations as observed by [Maghsoudi & Moshtari \(2021\)](#), [Besiou & Van Wassenhove \(2020\)](#), [Kirac & Milburn \(2018\)](#), [Kunz & Reiner \(2016\)](#), and [Kovacs & Spens \(2009\)](#). Other scholars may re-examine their implications and come up with practical solutions to mitigate their effects during relief operations more so during a pandemic.

Besides, the current study findings reveal that most actors especially celebrities, athletes, and politicians used social media to reach target beneficiaries, solicit donations, and publicize their operations as a form of accountability. There was a lot of data shared online most of which contained falsehoods especially exaggerating operation challenges in terms of the quality of supplies, speed of the operation, and theft of resources donated. In terms of disruption to the supply chain the falsehoods spread on social media increased pressure on the actors by presenting justifiable operational complexities as glaring failures, and hence discouraged more stakeholders from participating in the operations, and at times declining to honor their pledged support to the operations. This left operational actors with capacity gaps especially in terms of resources to fund the relief operation.

Strict or selective implementation of lockdown regulations created more operational challenges to the COVID-19 pandemic 2020 relief operation in Uganda. The additional absence of specific laws to regulate the activities of various actors during a relief operation was another challenge. This is in agreement with literature from other studies ([Baporikar & Shangheta, 2018](#); [Kovacs & Spens, 2009](#)). The current study findings reveal that political pronouncements replaced regulations and affiliation to the ruling government softened the operational environment while the association with the opposition made operations complex and at times led to radical sanctions like arrests with onward prosecution in courts of law with charges of conducting relief operations in a manner likely to spreading an infectious disease.

Furthermore, the upcoming political season was a challenge to relief supply chains, political players engaged in selective distribution of food and masks. Besides, there were shortages of relief supplies as political actors would compete for the existing food and masks with government agencies and other

humanitarian agencies. This was a challenge to the relief supply chain as it created a shortage of relief items due to the sharp rise in the prices of most of the items amidst inelastic financial resources.

The coming on board of many actors ranging from government agencies, humanitarian organizations, religious groups, celebrities, athletes, and politicians was an opportunity but at the same time a challenge. It was an opportunity to the extent of supporting the government which was duty-bound to provide relief support in form of food and masks for the safety of the citizens against COVID-9. On the other hand, it was a challenge since unlike government and experienced humanitarian agencies that had structures, existing staff, storage facilities, and experience in relief operations all of which the new actors lacked. Hence, the presence of such new actors in relief activities needs to be further explored especially during operations carried out during a pandemic.

Contribution and implications

The study sought to further the understanding of challenges along with relief supply. From the study findings, it was revealed that relief supply chains face a multitude of challenges in delivering relief supplies to the intended beneficiaries. Some of the challenges stem from needs assessment, procurement, transportation, warehousing, and last-mile distribution, all of which have been examined broadly by various scholars. However, the study has also identified other challenges like the growing influence and usage of social media, the emergence of new actors, and the influence of politics, rules, and governance on relief operations. Despite their influence on relief operations, there is limited literature on how they influence relief supply chains; hence scholars need to give them more attention. The aforementioned challenges disrupted operations during the COVID-19 pandemic response in 2020 in Uganda. They mostly increased the lead times, transportation delays, duplication of effort, and unequal distribution of relief supplies to the intended beneficiaries.

In line with the change theory, the study emphasizes the need for a participatory approach in needs identification. Such an approach ensures the right supplies reach the right beneficiaries in the right quality, condition, time, and cost.

Since it has been established the majority of the challenges encountered originated from lack of proper needs assessment, policy makers should commit resources as well as use the existing structures to ascertain the magnitude, need and locations of beneficiaries before commencing any relief operation. Such information guides in deciding the supply mix, procurement processes, and last-mile distribution activities.

Limitations and areas for further study

Like all studies, the current study could not run without limitations. In the first instance, this was a single case study on an operation during a pandemic. Its findings and conclusions may not be generalizable to other operations which differ in

context. Nevertheless, they may apply to similar situations in the present context. Whereas a single case study limits the transferability of findings, it provides answers to questions that arise when a need for a case arises (Creswell, 2014).

Additionally, the study was explorative – data were collected using semi-structured interviews that do not provide room for measurements as respondents are unable to assess to what extent they agreed with certain statements or were in disagreement. Other studies could be undertaken using surveys to get comparative views on actors involved in relief supply chains. By and large, other studies could be undertaken to examine how humanitarian agencies can better prepare for the influence of social media and better coordinate with the powerful influencers who have a high social media presence.

Conclusion

The present study identified several challenges in relief aid distribution. Some of the challenges were internal to the relief supply chain, others were beyond the chain. We identified challenges at the primary level of the needs assessment. Other challenges were the procurement, transportation, and storage of relief items. There were problems with distribution to the beneficiaries, as well as non-logistical challenges. Also, the media and its increasing influence on supply activities were featured during the discussions. The emergence of new actors coupled with the impact of politics and governance issues formed part of the study findings. The findings could inform leverage of several factors during relief item distribution in the next cycles.

Data availability

Underlying data

The data used and described in this paper comes from interviews about a sensitive Government programme on relief supply. The data were collected from government agencies and relief aid organizations and some of the respondents could

easily be identified, given their positions. For that reason, the dataset could not be deposited in an open repository. All raw data, including field notes, recordings, and transcripts are restricted from inclusion as part of the article. The restriction is in consideration of the requirements and guarantees provided to the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology that data pertaining to confidentiality of sensitive government programs, such as the COVID-19 relief operation 2020, may not be openly available. However, the data could be made available to an interested party upon reasonable request and under careful observance of the law. The dataset can be shared after the authors have sought for and been granted permission to share the dataset by the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology. Interested parties could contact rukundoaloy@yahoo.com or wilbroadiez@gmail.com.

Extended data

Figshare: Interview Guide on a study: Entropy in the “Entrepot”: Examining the Challenges of Relief Supply chains during COVID-19 Pandemic Relief Item Distribution Operation-2020 in Uganda. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20942644.v1>. (Rukundo & Aryatwijuka, 2022).

This project contains the following extended data:

- Relief Supply Interview Guide.pdf. (The interview guide used for collecting the data for this study).

Data are available under the terms of the Creative Commons Zero “No rights reserved” data waiver (CC0 1.0 Public domain dedication).

Author contributions

All authors participated in the ideation of the study and in coding and analysis of the data. WA applied for ethical review. AR and WA compiled the draft manuscript, while RN, AK, and FNK reviewed the manuscript. AR formatted the manuscript for submission.

References

Ahimbisibwe P: **Museveni orders two-week lockdown as COVID-19 cases rise.** The daily monitor, Kampala Uganda; 2020; Accessed 20th -April-2020.
[Reference Source](#)

Alexander D: **Celebrity culture, entertainment values... and disaster.** In: *Cultures and Disasters*. Routledge, 2015; 195–208.
[Reference Source](#)

Aryatwijuka W, Frederick NK, Rukundo A, *et al.*: **Exploration of Accountability as a Mediator between Managerial Competencies and Supply Chain Performance of Relief Aid Organisations in Western Uganda.** *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies*. 2022; 9(2): 104–119.
[Reference Source](#)

Balcik B, Beamon BM, Krejci CC, *et al.*: **Coordination in humanitarian relief**

chains: Practices, challenges and opportunities. *Int J Prod Econ*. 2010; 126(1): 22–34.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Balcik B, Beamon BM, Smilowitz K: **Last mile distribution in humanitarian relief.** *J Intell Transp Syst*. 2008; 12(2): 51–63.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Baporikar N, Shangheta LB: **Challenges facing humanitarian logistics in a nonprofit organization.** *Int J Appl Logist*. 2018; 8(1): 35–56.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Barnawal N: **Social media in the supply chain: the new trend.** 2014; (accessed 12th Jan 2021).

Besiou M, Hunter ML, van Wassenhove LN: **A web of watchdogs: Stakeholder**

media networks and agenda-setting in response to corporate initiatives. *J Bus Ethics*. 2013; **118**(4): 709–729.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Besiou M, van Wassenhove LN: **Humanitarian operations: A world of opportunity for relevant and impactful research**. *Manuf Serv Oper Manag*. 2020; **22**(1): 135–145.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Biggs D, Cooney R, Roe D, et al.: **Developing a theory of change for a community-based response to illegal wildlife trade**. *Conserv Biol*. 2017; **31**(1): 5–12.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Bölsche D, Klumpp M, Abidi H: **Specific competencies in humanitarian logistics education**. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2013; **3**(2): 99–128.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Browne E: **Theories of change for cash transfers**. GSDRC Applied Knowledge Services Help Desk Research Report, London: Governance and Social Development Resource Center (GSDRC), 2013; Accessed January, 2, 2021.

[Reference Source](#)

Creswell JW: **Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th ed.)**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014.

[Reference Source](#)

de Moura EH, Cruz TBR, Chiroli DMDG: **A framework proposal to integrate humanitarian logistics practices, disaster management and disaster mutual assistance: A Brazilian case**. *Safety Science*. 2020; **132**: 104965.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Funnell SC, Rogers PJ: **Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models**. John Wiley & Sons, 2011; **31**.

[Reference Source](#)

Houston JB, Hawthorne J, Perreault MF, et al.: **Social media and disasters: a functional framework for social media use in disaster planning, response, and research**. *Disasters*. 2015; **39**(1): 1–22.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Isabirye N, Musasizi B: **COVID-19 relief food distribution: impact and lessons for Uganda**. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2020; **35**(Suppl 2): 142.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

James C: **“Theory of Change Review” A report commissioned by Comic Relief**. London, 2011.

[Reference Source](#)

Jraisat L, Jreissat M, Upadhyay A, et al.: **Blockchain technology: the role of integrated reverse supply chain networks in sustainability**. In: *Supply Chain Forum: An International Journal*. Taylor & Francis, 2022; **24**(1): 17–30.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Kajoba N: **Uganda starts the distribution of free face masks to combat COVID-19**. *Xinhua*, 2020; Accessed 12th-July-2020.

[Reference Source](#)

Kapucu N: **The role of philanthropy in disaster relief**. *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy*. 2016; 178–192.

[Reference Source](#)

Kirac E, Millburn AB: **A general framework for assessing the value of social data for disaster response logistics planning**. *Eur J Oper Res*. 2018; **269**(2): 486–500.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Kovacs G, Moshtari M: **A roadmap for higher research quality in humanitarian operations: A methodological perspective**. *Eur J Oper Res*. 2019; **276**(2): 395–408. yh

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Kovács G, Spens K: **Identifying challenges in humanitarian logistics**. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*. 2009; **39**(6): 506–528.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Kovács G, Spens KM: **Trends and developments in humanitarian logistics - a Gap Analysis**. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*. 2011; **41**(1): 32–45.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Kovács G, Tatham P: **Responding to disruptions in the supply network-from dormant to action**. *Journal of Business Logistics*. 2009; **30**(2): 215–229.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Kunz N, Gold S: **Sustainable humanitarian supply chain management - exploring new theory**. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*. 2017; **20**(2): 85–104.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Kunz N, Reiner G: **Drivers of government restrictions on humanitarian supply chains: an exploratory study**. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2016; **6**(3): 329–351.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Leiras A, de Brito Jr I, Peres EQ, et al.: **Literature review of humanitarian logistics research: trends and challenges**. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2014; **4**(1): 95–130.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Leonardi PM, Huysman M, Steinfield C: **Enterprise social media:**

Definition, history, and prospects for the study of social technologies in organizations. *J Comput Mediat Commun*. 2013; **19**(1): 1–19.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

L'Hermitte C, Bowles M, Tatham P, et al.: **An integrated approach to agility in humanitarian logistics**. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2015; **5**(2): 209–233.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Maghfiroh MFN, Hanaoka S: **Last mile distribution in humanitarian logistics under stochastic and dynamic consideration**. In: *2017 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM)*. IEEE, 2017; 1411–1415.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Maghsoudi A, Moshtari M: **Challenges in disaster relief operations: evidence from the 2017 Kermanshah earthquake**. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2021; **11**(1): 107–134.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Makali J: **Ethics and procurement performance of humanitarian organizations in Kenya**. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi), 2015.

Makepeace D, Tatham P, Wu Y: **Internal integration in humanitarian supply chain management: Perspectives at the logistics-programmes interface**. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2017; **7**(1): 26–56.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Maria MJ, Githii W, Ombati OT: **Ethics and Procurement Performance of Humanitarian Organizations in Kenya**. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*. 2018; **8**(4): 833–849.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Miles MB, Huberman AM: **Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods**. In: *Qualitative data analysis: a sourcebook of new methods*. 1984; 263.

Miles MB, Huberman AM: **Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook**. sage, 1994.

[Reference Source](#)

Moshtari M, Gonçalves P: **Factors Influencing Interorganizational Collaboration within a Disaster Relief Context**. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. 2017; **28**(4): 1673–1694.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Muhammad N, Upadhyay A, Kumar A, et al.: **Achieving operational excellence through the lens of lean and Six Sigma during the COVID-19 pandemic**. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*. 2022; **33**(3): 818–835.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Mwangangi PW: **Influence of logistics management on the performance of manufacturing firms in Kenya**. (Doctoral dissertation, COHred, supply chain management, JKUAT), 2016.

[Reference Source](#)

O'Connor C, Joffe H: **Intercoder reliability in qualitative research: debates and practical guidelines**. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 2020; **19**: 1609406919899220.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Piggot-Irvine E, Rowe W, Ferkins L: **Conceptualizing indicator domains for evaluating action research**. *Educational Action Research*. 2015; **23**(4): 545–566.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Rashid Y, Rashid A, Warraich MA, et al.: **Case study method: A step-by-step guide for business researchers**. *Int J Qual Methods*. 2019; **18**: 1609406919862424.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Rukundo A, Aryatwijuka W: **Interview Guide on a study: Entropy in the “Entrepot”: Examining the Challenges of Relief Supply chains during COVID-19 Pandemic Relief Item Distribution Operation-2020 in Uganda**. *figshare*. [Dataset]. Journal contribution, 2022.

<http://www.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20942644.v1>

Sandwell C: **A qualitative study exploring the challenges of humanitarian organizations**. *J Humanit Logist Supply Chain Manag*. 2011; **1**(2): 132–150.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Shi Y: **Uganda starts relief food distribution for vulnerable people amid the COVID-19 lockdown**. *Xinhua*. 2020; Accessed 9th-July-2020.

[Reference Source](#)

Tatham P, Spens K, Kovács G: **The humanitarian common logistics operating picture: a solution to the inter-agency coordination challenge**. *Disasters*. 2017; **41**(1): 77–100.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Thomas A: **Humanitarian Logistics, Enabling Disaster Response**. The Fritz Institute, 2003.

[Reference Source](#)

Upadhyay A, Hernandez MJP, Balodi KC: **Covid-19 Disaster relief projects management: an exploratory study of critical success factors**. *Oper Manag Res*. 2022; 1–12.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Valters C: **Theories of change in international development: Communication, learning, or accountability?** *The Justice and Security Research Programme*. London, 2014; 29.

[Reference Source](#)

Van Wassenhove LN: **Humanitarian aid logistics: supply chain management**

in high gear. *J Oper Res Soc.* 2006; **57**(5): 475–489.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Wamba SF, Edwards A, Akter S: **Social media adoption and use for improved emergency services operations: The case of the NSW SES.** *Ann Oper Res.* 2019; **283**(1): 225–245.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Yates T, Zannat H, Khandaker N, *et al.*: **Evidence summary of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) coordination in humanitarian response.**

Disasters. 2020; **45**(4): 913–938.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Yin RK: **Case study research: Design and methods.** Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *The Canadian Journal of Action Research.* 2009; **14**(1): 69–71.

[Reference Source](#)

Yin RK: **Case study research and applications: Design and methods.** Sage publications, 2017.

[Reference Source](#)

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status:  

Version 2

Reviewer Report 09 June 2023

<https://doi.org/10.21956/emeraldopenres.16138.r28844>

© 2023 Upadhyay A. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

 **Arvind Upadhyay** 

Business School, University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Reviewer Report 24 May 2023

<https://doi.org/10.21956/emeraldopenres.16138.r28845>

© 2023 Kalubanga M. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

 **Matthew Kalubanga** 

Makerere University Business School, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

This is the second review of the paper—Entropy in ‘entrepot’: Examining the challenges of relief supply chains during COVID-19 pandemic relief item distribution operation—2020 in Uganda. The authors have vested sufficient efforts into improving the manuscript. All comments I provided on the earlier version have been adequately addressed/responded to.

However, I advise the authors to sufficiently proofread and edit the manuscript to alleviate probable problems such as typos, grammatical errors etc. that can easily pass unnoticed. Throughout the manuscript ensure uniformity in font type and font size. That is, quality assurance.

I will be happy to read the final version of the indexed manuscript.

Sincere congratulations to the authors upon producing this piece.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Public and private procurement, logistics, operations and supply chain management, supply chain competitiveness, business process disruptions, dynamic capabilities and firm competitiveness, sustainability in logistics and supply chains

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Version 1

Reviewer Report 06 December 2022

<https://doi.org/10.21956/emeraldopenres.15797.r28486>

© 2022 Kalubanga M. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Matthew Kalubanga 

Makerere University Business School, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

Review comments.

Thank you for offering me this opportunity to review the paper—Entropy in ‘entrepot’: Examining the challenges of relief supply chains during COVID-19 pandemic relief item distribution operation—2020 in Uganda. The authors examine the challenges encountered by those involved in the supply and distribution of relief items during the times of COVID-19 with a special interest in a developing country, Uganda. Realistically speaking, I find this study interesting, and in my view, the study could undoubtedly be of importance to both academics and practitioners. Not forgetting, the policy makers. The study applies a qualitative approach, and draws on interviews from 40 participants to gather responses that are analyzed for purposes of this manuscript. Overall, the study address an interesting aspect of research, which makes important contributions. However, the manuscript may not pass peer review in its current form. It requires some improvements. You will find below my detailed but humble comments. All these comments are intended to help the authors improve the quality of the manuscript to a level where it can be published in a journal.

Abstract:

- The abstract needs to be precise and more aligned to the study. Some sentences are not always correctly constructed. In particular, the first sentences of the abstract should be greatly improved, if at all they are needed.
- The use of ‘It’ ?

- The sentence starting with 'It was a case study.....', should be refined. Accordingly, the sentence reading 'The method of data collection and analysis was qualitative', is not clear. The authors should provide clarification regarding (a) data collection method(s) and (b) analysis method(s)
- The paragraph on 'Results: It was found.....'. 'Maybe write as "Findings of this study suggest that"
- The conclusion paragraph should be all embracing.

Introduction.

The authors write, at the end of the first paragraph; 'This study sought to explore the challenges encountered in the chain of supplying relief items during the COVID-19 response operation in 2020 in Uganda'. In my view, this sentence comes too early!

The authors refer to several research aspects such as 'relief supply', 'supply chain management', 'humanitarian logisticsetc.; it is not clear which of these aspects is the main focus of the study. That is, which of these aspects does the study relate to? The introduction should be improved to address this concern.

It would also be important for the authors to highlight the theoretical underpinnings of this research, and making clear the potential contribution.

Literature review

The literature review section –page 3 of 17 through to page 5 of 17, should be structured in a way that allows good reflection on the key concepts, and conceptual (as well as theoretical) developments underpinning the study and to which the study makes (or would make) a contribution; and the main research themes and sub-themes. That is, the research questions that emerge.

Methods/methodology**Ethical statement.**

The ethical statement is practically and technically richly written, and it is impressive. Thank you.

Population and sampling

Please, remove data collection methods from this section that seeks to address 'Population and Sampling. I suggest, you create a separate section (or subsection) where you address data collection methods. Provide a well thought justification for the data collection methods applied in the study.

Particularly, the section 'Population and Sampling' should address itself on the study population, the sample size, and the sampling procedures through which the sample was derived. It is desirable that relevant literature supporting the application of the sampling procedures used and the sample size drawn upon, is evoked.

For data collection, the authors talk about 'face-to-face' and 'electronic interviews'. I suggest, the authors should refer to 'online interviews' and NOT 'electronic interviews'.

The authors may wish to clarify more about the criteria for including celebrities, social media and

academicians among the interviewees!! On reading through the manuscript, this is not always clear. Were these participants subjected to a similar interview protocol as other interviewees? Type of questions applying?

In Table 1 'Presentation of respondents demographic characteristics', under line item 'interview type', the authors breakdown the interviews into 'face-to-face, telephone and zoom', how do these relate with the earlier classifications of 'face-to-face' and 'electronic'. I have suggested using 'online interviews' for 'electronic interviews' though! Are 'telephone interviews' categorized as belonging to 'face-to-face' or 'electronic'? The authors must sort out this ambiguity.

Again in Table 1, under item 'respondent category', the authors categorize respondents into 8; 'Government Agencies, International Humanitarian Organizations, National Humanitarian Organizations, Academia, Religious Groups, Social Media Influences, Celebrities, and Main Stream Media Houses". Were the interviews administered on organizations? How? Or individuals? This is not clear. How were these categories represented in the study population as well as sample size? What was the basis for determining these representations? Are there systematic methodological principles that were applied?

The sections on presentation and discussion of findings should be further developed. The authors should refine their writings and ensure that their ideas/arguments/views are precise.

This work should provide policy recommendations that would help in re-engineering Uganda's readiness in dealing with disruptive pandemics such as COVID-19 that may manifest in future times. The revised version of the manuscript should incorporate policy recommendations, with greater clarity.

Overall, the entire manuscript should be subjected to comprehensive professional editing and proofreading. I recommend the use of a professional editor. This will help in addressing the severe problems with sentence constructions, redundancies, typos and omissions, as well as creating greater coherence in the ideas presented in the manuscript.

Minor comments

Throughout the manuscript, apply uniform font type and font size.

The last section, starting on page 11 of 17 through to page 12 of 17, should be 'Conclusion' and not 'Conclusions'.

Consistently, apply the APA format (or if otherwise, a uniform format) of literature citation and referencing.

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Partly

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?

Partly

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?

No

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Partly

Is the argument information presented in such a way that it can be understood by a non-academic audience?

Yes

Does the piece present solutions to actual real world challenges?

Yes

Is real-world evidence provided to support any conclusions made?

No

Could any solutions being offered be effectively implemented in practice?

No

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Public and private procurement, logistics, operations and supply chain management, supply chain competitiveness, business process disruptions, dynamic capabilities and firm competitiveness, sustainability in logistics and supply chains

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 30 Jan 2023

Aloysius Rukundo, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

Thank you reviewer for your kind and constructive comments. We are now through with fixing the suggested changes, and I am happy that the manuscript has taken a better shape.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Report 02 November 2022

<https://doi.org/10.21956/emeraldopenres.15797.r28436>

© 2022 Upadhyay A. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Arvind Upadhyay 

Business School, University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway

The article is an interesting one. The article covers a wide set of disciplines. The following comments will help improve the manuscript.

1. The introduction section is reasonable, written well, but very narrowly focussed; therefore, the authors must check to make it more relevant to the journal.
2. The research question(s) are not clear; if the authors can add research objectives following research contributions, then it will increase readability.
3. Research assumptions need a more theoretical base. The author(s) should link the assumptions to existing literature.
4. It would be nice to see some kind of conceptual framework for this research.
5. I would suggest refining your research methodology. At the moment, rather limited discussion on research philosophy.
6. Critically analyse different theoretical approaches to the research problem
7. Justify the solution method selected in terms of the research objectives
8. Strengthen the motivation and discussion parts substantially.
9. Demonstrate adequately that your solution findings have been logically derived and that conclusions, solutions/recommendations are fully supported by evidence
10. While this is still a budding topic, still one can find many research papers in other reputed journals as well. I'd suggest referring to the below academic papers in your manuscript. For a literature review, repeat what you would do with a paper summary, only with more papers. Discuss them one at a time, and tie them all together with your discussion. Go back and revisit a paper that you have already discussed, if another paper brings up a topic that you want to discuss. Use sentences like, "Simpson suggests that the universe may in fact be doughnut shaped [1]. Others agree with this possibility, including Hawking [2]. Syzlak and Gumble apparently were the first to publish such a claim [3], but their research is highly speculative." I do not want you to report what the paper says. In fact, you should present your summary so that it stands on its own, with the paper you reference as a back-up. *You are explaining something, and pointing to your source to re-affirm what you say.*

Literature reviews are a bit different. Here, you also want a stand-alone document, but focus on comparing and contrasting what researchers.

The authors must check all references carefully, there are some references are cited in the text and vice versa.

References

1. Upadhyay A, Hernandez M, Balodi K: Covid-19 Disaster relief projects management: an exploratory study of critical success factors. *Operations Management Research*. 2022. [Publisher Full Text](#)
2. Jraisat L, Jreissat M, Upadhyay A, Kumar A: Blockchain Technology: The Role of Integrated Reverse Supply Chain Networks in Sustainability. *Supply Chain Forum: An International Journal*. 2022. 1-14 [Publisher Full Text](#)
3. Wang Z, Upadhyay A, Kumar A: A real options approach to growth opportunities and resilience aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Modelling in Management*. 2022. [Publisher Full Text](#)
4. Abdul Rahman N, Ahmi A, Jraisat L, Upadhyay A: Examining the trend of humanitarian supply chain studies: pre, during and post COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*. 2022. [Publisher Full Text](#)
5. Muhammad N, Upadhyay A, Kumar A, Gilani H: Achieving operational excellence through the lens of lean and Six Sigma during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*. 2022; **33** (3): 818-835 [Publisher Full Text](#)
6. Jraisat L, Upadhyay A, Ghalia T, Jresseit M, et al.: Triads in sustainable supply-chain perspective: why is a collaboration mechanism needed?. *International Journal of Production Research*. 2021. 1-17 [Publisher Full Text](#)
7. Upadhyay A, Laing T, Kumar V, Dora M: Exploring barriers and drivers to the implementation of circular economy practices in the mining industry. *Resources Policy*. 2021; **72**. [Publisher Full Text](#)
8. Agrawal R, Wankhede V, Kumar A, Upadhyay A, et al.: Nexus of circular economy and sustainable business performance in the era of digitalization. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 2022; **71** (3): 748-774 [Publisher Full Text](#)
9. Jæger B, Menebo M, Upadhyay A: Identification of environmental supply chain bottlenecks: a case study of the Ethiopian healthcare supply chain. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*. 2021; **32** (6): 1233-1254 [Publisher Full Text](#)
10. Upadhyay A, Ayodele J, Kumar A, Garza-Reyes J: A review of challenges and opportunities of blockchain adoption for operational excellence in the UK automotive industry. *Journal of Global Operations and Strategic Sourcing*. 2021; **14** (1): 7-60 [Publisher Full Text](#)
11. Upadhyay A: Antecedents of green supply chain practices in developing economies. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*. 2021; **32** (6): 1150-1165 [Publisher Full Text](#)
12. Upadhyay A, Mukhuty S, Kumari S, Garza-Reyes J, et al.: A review of lean and agile management in humanitarian supply chains: analysing the pre-disaster and post-disaster phases and future directions. *Production Planning & Control*. 2022; **33** (6-7): 641-654 [Publisher Full Text](#)
13. Jaeger B, Upadhyay A: Understanding barriers to circular economy: cases from the manufacturing industry. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*. 2020; **33** (4): 729-745 [Publisher Full Text](#)
14. Al-kalouti J, Kumar V, Kumar N, Garza-Reyes J, et al.: Investigating innovation capability and organizational performance in service firms. *Strategic Change*. 2020; **29** (1): 103-113 [Publisher Full Text](#)
15. Laing T, Upadhyay A, Mohan S, Subramanian N: Environmental improvement initiatives in the coal mining industry: maximisation of the triple bottom line. *Production Planning & Control*. 2019; **30** (5-6): 426-436 [Publisher Full Text](#)

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

No

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?

Yes

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?

No

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

No

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Is the argument information presented in such a way that it can be understood by a non-academic audience?

Yes

Does the piece present solutions to actual real world challenges?

No

Is real-world evidence provided to support any conclusions made?

No

Could any solutions being offered be effectively implemented in practice?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Sustainable supply chain

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 30 Jan 2023

Aloysius Rukundo, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara, Uganda

Dear reviewer, thank you for your kind comments. We are now through with fixing most of the important suggestions you made in your review report.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.