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Executive Summary
Women's Fund Armenia, Women's Fund in Georgia, Ukrainian Women's Fund, and filia.die frauenstiftung (Germany) commissioned the assessment of institutional and team resilience in their respective organizations, as well as partners. The goal of the assessment was to inform the participating four women's funds and their respective partners, women’s rights organizations in Armenia, Georgia, Germany and Ukraine about their readiness to deal with crises. The objective of the assessment is to measure the existing needs regarding institutional (i.e., financial, psycho-social, organizational) and team resilience.

For the purpose of this assessment, the benchmarking of organizational resilience has used the conceptualization of the Resilient Organizations research program funded by the Foundation for Research Science and Technology of New Zealand. In this case, borrowed from the above-stated research program, the term resilience, when referring to organizations, was defined as "a function of an organization’s (a) situation awareness; (b) management of keystone vulnerabilities and (c) adaptive capacity in a complex, dynamic and interconnected environment." It derived from a hypothesis that regardless of its size for each organization organizational resilience is a function of resilience ethos, situation awareness, management of keystone vulnerabilities, and adaptive capacity.

In parallel, the assessment of team resilience adopted a relatively new tool that is measured to predict employee performance. Psychological Capital (PsyCap) is a survey with 24 questions that allow individuals to rate themselves. Based on the responses, the PsyCap derives measures of Hope, Efficacy, Resiliency, and Optimism. The PsyCap model is based on extensive theory-building and research. Psychological Capital (PsyCap) is a survey with 24 questions that allow individuals to rate themselves.

The assessment findings aimed to inform future programming and organizational development of the four funds that commissioned the project, as well as that of their partner organizations. The period determined for the delivery of findings spanned over 4 months, i.e. November of 2022 to February of 2023. It required adopting a methodology that would use already tested variables, pretested questions with identified significant
correlations that would be valid and reliable for measuring organizational and team resilience.

Surveys were conducted online, using SurveyMonkey survey software. The translated and recorded questions were organized into 4 separate surveys. The surveys were first pre-tested with the representatives from 4 funds to avoid technical, translation-related and other human errors. Cleared versions were released on December 7, 2022. From January 13-19, 2023, based on the response rates reaching suggested sample size, were closed. During the second half of January and first week of February 2023, surveys were decoded back to the initial coding and retranslated into English language. Open-ended questions and an overall quality check were conducted by the representatives of the respective funds.

This sampling was driven by the size of organizations that were invited by the Funds to take part in the survey. For small organizations with employees of up to 30 people no sampling was conducted. For organizations that had more than 30 staff members 85% were sampled with all the managers included in the sample. In case there were large organizations with more than 100 employees, 80% was suggested to be included in the sample with all the managers required to take part in it. However, no large organization took part in this survey. Volunteers working in organizations were invited to participate but were mandated to complete the survey.

Ethical clearance was not sought in the case of this assessment. The two tools were previously cleared by ethical boards of the respective institutions in the countries where the surveys were first conducted. An ethical statement preceded the survey, providing information on the purpose, time required and anonymity of survey results. A contact person was included in the consent form for prospective participants to ask questions and raise concern before agreeing to take part in it. Only consented individuals have been given access to the survey questions.

Armenian organizations exhibit high levels of resilience. There is an overall healthy level of connectedness and a sense of citizenship behavior. It can further benefit from making deliberate planning, corrective and development actions that can further increase the preparedness and adaptiveness to unexpected developments. One area of strategic reflection and action is how organizations communicate internally and across the network. Armenian organizations can together map their connectedness that already exists and areas where they can pull resources together. A possible option that organizations can consider is to engage in multi-organizational Readiness Exercises and Disaster Simulations (REDS). Using the previous emergencies and crises, they can together plot the resources they used, the way they used them, how they communicated within, among and across, what was disrupted, how they handled it, who were the key decision makers ex officio or de facto, what were the things they missed at the time, but realized later that were key patterns to watch out for, what are the possible emerging patterns currently.
Background and rationale

Women’s Fund Armenia, Women’s Fund in Georgia, Ukrainian Women’s Fund, and filia.die frauenstiftung (Germany) commissioned the assessment of institutional and team resilience in their respective organizations, as well as partners. The goal of the assessment was to inform the participating four women’s funds and their respective partners, women’s rights organizations in Armenia, Georgia, Germany and Ukraine about their readiness to deal with crises. The objective of the assessment is to measure the existing needs regarding institutional (i.e., financial, psycho-social, organizational) and team resilience.

In a growingly interconnected world, susceptible to more frequently felt shocks and unexpected events, making sure that organizations operate without major disruptions is a growing area of scientific and applied interest. The growing demand for organizations to sustain reliability when faced with adversities forces decision-makers to master known and unknown crises. The need to know how resilient the organization is to withstand disruptive events and recover from them as quickly as possible.

The wider political context leaves little room for hope regarding an environment with sufficient predictability. More specifically, at the time when the assessment validation workshop started and throughout the entire process of data collection, the war launched by Russia against Ukraine was leaving its devastating impact on human lives, critical infrastructure and organizations operating in a state of emergency. Armenia was, yet, recovering from the 44-day war and the later escalation of the conflict into the proper territory of the country. The geopolitics of the continent was evolving under the repeated threat of use of tactical nuclear weapons, in the meantime, showing worrisome signs of post-WWII international order not being able to adequately respond to the challenges. The situation was exacerbated by possible food and energy shortages. On the metarelational level, the fundamental human rights and freedoms and principles of democratic state governance were being put to test by belligerent rhetoric and revisionist state policies in wider Europe.

At the backdrop of active political disruptions, countries and in this case, the four Funds, as well as their partners were recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic that had impacted countries, respective economies, disrupting entire sectors and unexpectedly changing the environment in which organizations and people could operate. The rapidly changing context with many possible unpredictable events has increased the need among organizations to gain insight into their team and organizational resilience to be better prepared in the face of adversity and instability.

For the purpose of this assessment, the benchmarking of organizational resilience has used the conceptualization of the Resilient Organizations research program1 funded by the Foundation for Research Science and Technology of New Zealand. In this case, borrowed
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from the above-stated research program, the term resilience, when referring to organizations, was defined as "a function of an organization's (a) situation awareness; (b) management of keystone vulnerabilities and (c) adaptive capacity in a complex, dynamic and interconnected environment." It derived from a hypothesis that regardless of its size for each organization organizational resilience is a function of resilience ethos, situation awareness, management of keystone vulnerabilities, and adaptive capacity. The choice of this particular methodology and measurement approach was justified by the fact that the variables and related questions were pretested, statistical significances were determined, and it was used in measuring ten for-profit, as well as non-for-profit organizations in New Zealand. Although, feminist non-for-profit organizations tend to have structures that prefer collective, participatory management and less bureaucracy, nevertheless, most of the questions remain relevant to the needs assessment at institutional level. Bearing in mind the specificity of participating institutions, prior to the finalization of the measurement framework a validation workshop was conducted with all the respective funds. Later, during the analysis stage, a feminist approach to the interpretation of survey findings was adopted.

In parallel, the assessment of team resilience adopted a relatively new tool that is measured to predict employee performance. Psychological Capital (PsyCap) is a survey with 24 questions that allow individuals to rate themselves. Based on the responses, the PsyCap derives measures of Hope, Efficacy, Resiliency, and Optimism. The PsyCap model is based on extensive theory-building and research. Psychological Capital (PsyCap) is a survey with 24 questions that allow individuals to rate themselves. Based on the responses, the PsyCap derives measures of Hope, Efficacy, Resiliency, and Optimism. It identifies individual's positive psychological state of development in regard to (a) persevering toward goals, or when needed redirecting towards goals geared to succeed; (b) having hands-on attitude when challenged by new tasks; (c) exhibiting the capacity to sustain and bounce back from adverse events; and (d) having positive outlook to current and future success. The published research has shown that PsyCap correlates well with several workplace outcomes, such as levels of absenteeism among staff, intentions to quit vs. higher job satisfaction, commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. It has also shown relevance for assessing the overall state of teams when it comes to performance and leadership.

PsyCap is a robust tool. It has undergone psychometric analysis, drawing from the survey results conducted in service, manufacturing, education, high-tech and other sectors. Although, feminist non-for-profits run on a different ethos than most of the other organizations, the questions used by PsyCap, and its emphasis on the individual makes it
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applicable for this assessment. Placing individuals in the center of organization's resilience and building human-centric structure, processes and leadership resonates well with the approach of feminist collectives and organizations that emphasize the empowerment of their members. For the purpose of this assessment, it was hypoththesized that PsyCap scores were positively correlated with Relative Overall Resilience (ROR).

The adoption of ROR measurement model, variables and questions will allow for better informed collaboration, cross-support and granting priorities when it comes to improving the situation awareness of Funds and their partners, dealing with vulnerabilities by identifying needed resources, adopting strategies, finding the right balance between institutionalized and team specific processes and taking needed steps to build the capacity of the organization and the team to adapt to unexpected and adverse events. In combination with PsyCap practical steps for further supporting staff and member well-being can be derived and programmed, as a human-centric feminist approach to conceptualizing resilience, synergistically contributing to the improvement of ROR as a secondary objective.

**Resilience Measurement Theoretical Foundations**

In early 2000s, the sharp increase in accidents was attributed to the increased complexity of social and technological systems, turning those into inseparable part of today's life. The two are intertwined, as humans for the organization of their social life increasingly rely on technology and those service providers, increasing their vulnerability in exchange for interconnectedness. This makes the crises more complex, interconnected and transboundary. Not surprisingly, organizations increasingly focus their attention on preparing for response to crises. It requires resource and time allocation, which in an environment of competing priorities is difficult to justify, especially given that measuring progress on the way to becoming more resilient is a challenging task. The more recent approaches to measuring resilience within organizations concentrate on capturing the strengths and weaknesses before the crisis occurs.

Before measuring resilience, it is key to define crisis and crisis management through the lenses of crisis management theory. In this context, crisis is better defined as complex technologically, organizationally or socially bound events that cause wide-ranging damage
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and disruption, impacting multiple stakeholders\textsuperscript{10}. Along with the perspective that looks at crises as large-scale events, another school of thought defines it as something that can be gradually accumulated. Therefore, avoiding or preventing all crises is not an option, instead, suggesting concentrating on the ability to adapt to fast-changing environment, making it a feature of resilience\textsuperscript{11} and a process known as crisis management. Emerging from the analyses of industrial accidents, in late 2000s, crisis management was redefined as a strategy for the organization to achieve the outcome of being resilient\textsuperscript{12}. In all of this, from the perspective of crisis management theory organizations are regarded as systems.

From systems’ thinking perspective, viewing groups as systems allows one to concentrate on components and identify relationships between them as factors for potential failure or strength. Analyzing the speed of those relationships between components raises the need for observing such qualities as complexity and coupling. Systems then are defined as having components that are loosely or tightly coupled\textsuperscript{13}. Tightly coupled components tend to experience chain reactions under strained circumstances, as there is no gap between them, while loosely coupled components are not necessarily subject to the same intensity of transfiguration or impact. In business-as-usual circumstances tightly coupled components are geared for fast results, which in adverse situations increases their vulnerability to speedy failure. The opposite is true for loosely coupled components, such as is the case of any university. This becomes important for organizational resilience, as it depicts the connectivity and responsiveness between the organization and its environment\textsuperscript{14}. Another important quality is complexity that describe interactions with unfamiliar sequences, or unplanned and unexpected sequences, are either not visible or not immediately comprehensible\textsuperscript{15}. Unlike linear systems that are quite predictable, but not flexible, complex systems produce problems, but also increase resilience due to their propensity to produce redundancy (internal idleness). In trying to identify the key inherent vulnerabilities, then it is crucial to keep an eye on these two qualities to understand where components would have high propensity for failure when events derail the organization from its business-as-usual modus.

Decoupled from humans, systems thinking has a major shortcoming. Humans that operate within the organizations are viewed as part of the system but are also required to stand outside of it to reflect on its features\textsuperscript{16}. This is more important for feminist collectives and non-for-profits that have team driven management practices and less bureaucracy to be


viewed from systems’ thinking theory perspective. Thus, the need to adopt a multidisciplinary outlook that looks at crisis-management as a process, and resilience as its goal from three domains, i.e. socio-political, technological-structural and psychological\textsuperscript{17}. In this case, perceptions of decision makers become part of the measured endeavor as those are the only tools that allow players in the system, i.e. organization, to interpret the wider environment and arising or possible risks. Individual and collective actions to crisis response or its anticipation become variables for observation.

Coming to the goal of crisis management, and initially observed in materials engineering, stress-strain state space analogy is used to quantify organizational resilience viewing it as an adaptive capacity\textsuperscript{18}. The uniform response and extra region first and second order adaptive capacities are identified, when in the first order region organizations adopt a uniform response, using existing capacity and capability, whereas during the second order response they tap into their creative capacity to respond to demands that exceed the limit of the first order adaptations\textsuperscript{19}. Only when organizations are fit to go beyond existing plans and procedures, finding new ways of working, do they qualify to be labeled as resilient.

Putting humans in the center of resilience research is the missing link, as studies have shown how human strengths have shown to have positive correlation with thriving organizations\textsuperscript{20}. Measuring individual psychological capital comprising specific constructs of hope, efficacy, resiliency, and optimism is a base variable for measuring team and organizational resilience. It is believed to be correlated with second order adaptive capacity, when existing plans and procedures are not en par with unfolding unexpected events, as an approximation for the resourcefulness to tap into new solutions and ways for dealing with the challenge. It is believed that individual’s positive psychological state of development is a good predictor of how well s(he) will persevere towards goals and, if necessary, redirect paths to goals to succeed\textsuperscript{21}. Thus, hope is a quality sought after when a first order response is no longer valid. Another quality that is critical for second order response is efficacy, which is adopted from Bandura’s self-efficacy theory. The mastery of experiences, through experiencing success by breaking down complex tasks into successful sub-components is the capital, which is resorted to during unexpected or adverse events. Resting on Masten’s research informed by developmental systems theory and contemporary developmental psychology while studying the effects of war and disasters on children,\textsuperscript{22} individual resiliency focuses on enhancing an individual’s perceived and actual level of assets and resources to increase the probability of positive outcomes. Discussed earlier, in system’s thinking theory looking at relationships of an organization's

\textsuperscript{19} ibid
components and trying to reflect on it requires resiliency as identification of the risks and possible response pathways is fully contingent on the individual’s perception and reading of her environment. Finally, based on Schneider’s research on realistic optimism\textsuperscript{23} as leniency for the past and appreciation of the present are qualities that protect from defeatist attitudes, which paralyze planning efforts and motivation for future improvements. In adverse situations, realistic optimism is another key quality that can help to adapt to the second order phase and not feel disempowered by lack of direction or absence of procedures.

**Methodology**

The assessment findings aimed to inform future programming and organizational development of the four funds that commissioned the project, as well as that of their partner organizations. The period determined for the delivery of findings spanned over 4 months, i.e. November of 2022 to February of 2023. It required adopting a methodology that would use already tested variables, pretested questions with identified significant correlations that would be valid and reliable for measuring organizational and team resilience. Thus, in the inception report it was recommended to adopt the benchmarking of organizational resilience used in the Resilient Organizations research program\textsuperscript{24} funded by the Foundation for Research Science and Technology of New Zealand. Turning to measuring team resilience, it was recommended to adopt PsyCap as studies had confirmed that it predicted employee performance and satisfaction. There was a significant relationship that PsyCap captured satisfaction, commitment, psychological well-being or cynicism, turnover intention, stress and anxiety, as well as organizational citizenship behaviors, deviance, and employee performance. Given that the measured aspects of organizational citizenship and employee performance resonated with the definition of meaningful employment as an approximation of staff engagement and involvement, it was useful to adopt the already tested valid and reliable questions found in PsyCap. Finally, the adopted definition under staff engagement and involvement as "engagement and involvement of organizational staff so that they are responsible, accountable and occupied with developing the organization’s resilience through their work because they understand the links between the organization’s resilience and its long-term success," was believed to be well measured by the suggested survey.

For finalization of the survey a validation workshop was conducted on October 28-29, 2022. The variables of ROR and PsyCap along with the specific questions were discussed and adjusted to feminist non-for-profits. In ROR, a variable intending to measure the aspect of healing was added with three specific questions that captured the leading practices in organizations as a measure of increased reliability. The measures were not pre-tested for


validity and reliability. The mitigation strategy adopted for the purpose of this assessment was to adopt a null hypothesis that qualities exhibited by leaders had no effect on overall resilience, i.e. organizational and team. It was tested using all the responses from funds and partners without segregation of the country. The final survey questionnaire was decided to translate into native languages (see Annex I) to avoid linguistic bias. Most of all, a key intention was to ensure that respondents with varying degrees of English language competence were not put in an inconvenient situation. It also ensured minimization of misconceptions and contamination of responses. Translations were not pre-tested.

Surveys were conducted online, using SurveyMonkey survey software. The translated and recorded questions were organized into 4 separate surveys. The surveys were first pre-tested with the representatives from 4 funds to avoid technical, translation-related and other human errors. Cleared versions were released on December 7, 2022. From January 13-19, 2023, based on the response rates reaching suggested sample size, were closed. During the second half of January and first week of February 2023, surveys were decoded back to the initial coding and retranslated into English language. Open-ended questions and an overall quality check were conducted by the representatives of the respective funds. Databases were kept on servers and/or computers of representatives of funds and the personal computer of the person responsible for data handling and processing. Data processing was finalized by the last week of February 2023 (see Annex II).

**Assessment Methods and Framework**

The assessment measures “the function of an organization’s situation awareness, management of keystone vulnerabilities and adaptive capacity in a complex, dynamic and interconnected environment”\(^{25}\). The 21 indicators used to measure situation awareness, management of keystone vulnerabilities, and adaptive capacity are provided in the table below:

**Table 1. Dimensions and Indicators of Organizational Resilience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience Overall Resilience (ROR)</th>
<th>Management of Keystone Vulnerabilities</th>
<th>Adaptive Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE1 Commitment to Resilience</td>
<td>Planning Strategies</td>
<td>AC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE2 Network Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silo Mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situation Awareness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Management of Keystone Vulnerabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adaptive Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1 Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>KV 1 Planning Strategies</td>
<td>AC2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA2 Understanding of Hazard and Consequences</td>
<td>KV 2 Participation in Exercises</td>
<td>Communications and Relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resilience Ethos: Perceptions about risks, as earlier mentioned, especially the ones held by people in decision-making roles have significant impact on the overall organization and how it conceptualizes crisis management\textsuperscript{26}. The perceptions can drive the preparedness process or predetermine inherent vulnerabilities. Being prepared would mean at leadership level a commitment to certain degree of unlearning, which has systems in place that helps to rethink and overhaul existing procedures\textsuperscript{27}. Doing it in a shared, community-like approach, refreshing the knowledge together, is what builds the culture of resilience\textsuperscript{28}. Commitment to Resilience and Network Perspective indicators are built on a definition that "a culture of resilience that is embedded within the organization across all hierarchical levels and disciplines, where the organization is a system managing its presence as part of a network, and where resilience issues are key considerations for all decisions that are made\textsuperscript{29}". Therefore, instead of the preoccupation with preparing for all hazards and disasters, which in itself is an impossible task, committed organizations learn from their errors, but also have practices for recognizing emerging patterns. Related to this, organizations that operate as networks are more agile and are better at adapting to uncertainties\textsuperscript{30}.

**Situation Awareness:** In being able to make decisions, it is of vital importance to be able to evaluate the situation, especially when one thinks of crisis situations. Thus, situation awareness is defined as awareness of events happening around an entity and understanding what that information means now and could mean in the future. For organizations to be able to make sense of the situation, it is important to develop a shared awareness as an informal cooperative strategy facilitating work, overall efficiency, safety and resilience. For the purpose of this assessment situation awareness definition of Resilient organizations research programme is adopted, whereby "an organization's understanding of its operating landscape, its awareness of what is happening around it, and what that information means for the organization now and in the future. Interlinked to that, the seven suggested empirically validated indicators serve as proxies for measuring awareness.

**Management of Keystone Vulnerabilities:** The term vulnerability has many definitions, but for the purpose of this assessment, it is suggested to adopt McManus's definition that focuses on organizational vulnerability. Based on case studies and survey research organizational losses or failure during or after disasters have been explored. For the organization to manage the vulnerabilities, the "identification, proactive management, and treatment of vulnerabilities that if realized, would threaten the organization's ability to survive" become the foundation for measurement adopted by McManus. Interlinked to that, the seven suggested empirically validated indicators serve as proxies for measuring awareness.

Within the measurement of keystone vulnerabilities, it is important to look into the indicators of Capability and Capacity of Internal Resources and Staff Engagement and Involvement. Although McManus only refers to physical resources and process resources as components of overall internal resources, it is important to also counter human resources. It is important, as the indicator of staff engagement and involvement sees meaningful employment that fully uses the staff member's competencies and helps build self-determination as a function of organizational resilience. Therefore, incorporating measurement indicators that approximate those aspects of resilience and look at the resilience of employees as individuals and as parts of operating teams should be considered as a valuable addition to the assessment of organizational resilience.

**Adaptive capacity** is the ability of an organization to respond to changes in its environment and to recover from damage to its structures that affect its ability to achieve its goals. Adaptive capacity is envisaged as a space in which the organization's
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performance or management of the disaster fluctuates until it reaches an equilibrium\(^{35}\). For this assessment, the seven empirically validated indicators that measure the following definition are applied: "Strong leadership and culture which enables clear communication, good working relationships, and a shared vision across the organization. The organization is innovative and creative, and people can constantly and continuously act to match or exceed the needs of the organization's operating environment in anticipation of, or in response to change\(^{36}\)." In relation to adaptive capacity, embedding the PsyCap as a measurement tool is instrumental as it is a good predictor of performance, which is correlated to several proxies within the definition and, thus, the indicators.

PsyCap is a relatively new tool that was developed in the USA but has since been tested in various contexts. Several studies have shown the value of PsyCap in predicting employee performance\(^{37}\) and satisfaction\(^{38}\). There is a significant relationship that PsyCap captures organizational citizenship behaviors that are interlinked with dimensions of the ROR model. This tool was incorporated into the ROR model to tailor the model to feminist non-for-profits that put much emphasis on the wellbeing of their members. Furthermore, since the ROR model is firmly based on theories stemming from industry, military, organizations that operate in high-risk environments, it was important to factor the importance of individual and collective behavior into the system's thinking. Finally, since the literature mostly discussed firms or non-for-profits with bigger staff, it was crucial to know that some of the ready-made suggestions coming from field experience would not fit the philosophy and structure of feminist organizations. The analytics, thus, was not intended to provide ready recipes or rigid solutions but give some directions for further exploration by the organizations and their members. In trying to come up with resilience strategies for smaller non-for-profits, an attempt to find balanced formulas addressing the strengths and weaknesses as starters for future actions became the axis of the analysis.

Both ROR and PsyCap surveys apply Likert scales that are used to measure several things, in this case they measure the level of agreement. The numerical value applied to each option measured the attitude of respondents. To avoid social desirability bias the survey did not ask questions that would reveal the identities of respondents. The explicit statement in the beginning of the survey on anonymity and the fact that it was a self-administered questionnaire further reduced the social pressure to project certain attitudes. Nevertheless, it is impossible to fully rule out the social desirability bias given the inherent propensities that humans have that tend to interpret the self and the surroundings in a positive light. The ROR model also had questions with open ended responses and multiple-choice questions that were kept in the questionnaire after a factor analysis.

\(^{35}\) ibid
Sampling
This sampling was driven by the size of organizations that were invited by the Funds to take part in the survey. For small organizations with employees of up to 30 people no sampling was conducted. For organizations that had more than 30 staff members 85% were sampled with all the managers included in the sample. In case there were large organizations with more than 100 employees, 80% was suggested to be included in the sample with all the managers required to take part in it. However, no large organization took part in this survey. Volunteers working in organizations were invited to participate but were mandated to complete the survey.

Ethical clearance was not sought in the case of this assessment. The two tools were previously cleared by ethical boards of the respective institutions in the countries where the surveys were first conducted. An ethical statement preceded the survey, providing information on the purpose, time required and anonymity of survey results. A contact person was included in the consent form for prospective participants to ask questions and raise concern before agreeing to take part in it. Only consented individuals have been given access to the survey questions.

The protection of personal data of the respondents was an important element of the assessment. The researcher was bound by the data protection laws of the country in which data collection occurred. Thus, committed to the secrecy and confidentiality of the data collected for the study. The software data was not shared with any third party, including the organizations commissioning the study. To protect the received personal data from unauthorized access and abuse, the datasets were downloaded and encrypted with the SurveyMonkey dataset destroyed within 30 days after the completion of the survey.

The researcher agreed that, upon termination or expiration of the contract and full acceptance of the report, all survey data will be erased from the computer and the Funds will be notified in writing that these actions have been completed within thirty (30) days after the expiration or termination of the contract.

Evidence, Analysis and Findings

ARMENIA
Women’s Fund Armenia and partners, i.e. Women’s agenda, Women’s Rights House, WRC Shushi, Kanani, Socioscope, and SACC show a high level of organizational resilience projected through the attitudes of the respondents. Figure 1 shows the overall picture of all the participant organizations. There is a high degree of connectedness and a sense of citizenship behavior through commitment to crisis preparedness. More specifically, respondents mostly agreed that their respective organizations had a clear understanding of the relationships within the partner network and had balanced short and long-term
priorities. They also mostly agreed that there is a strong sense of collaboration among civil society organizations to manage unexpected challenges.

Figure 1. ARMENIA: Relative Organizational Resilience Diagram

It is, however, important to pay attention to the gray zone that suggests a significant level of undecidedness on all four fronts. It is encouraging to see that most of the attitudes congregate around one pole, clearly showing that most agree with the presence of resilience culture within their organizations and across, in the meantime, nevertheless, the same resilience culture requires recognizing the early patterns that can accumulate over time and lead to unexpected developments. The gray line marked as “Moderate” has summed throughout the survey those responses that on a Likert scale had chosen to answer, “Somewhat disagree”. Although, these respondents mostly agree, nevertheless, looking from the perspective of crisis management and early action with the purpose to avoid accumulating system weakness through slight divergence and disagreement, it is better to pay attention to those background voices early in the process as to introduce corrections and adapt gradually.

Finally, when separately looking at the responses of the fund staff vs partners, the overall organizational resilience records a relatively modest picture when it comes to the adaptive capacity and situation awareness of the fund. It seems that the share of the respondents from the fund that believe in their ability to respond to changes in the environment and recover from damage is smaller when compared to partners. However, when singling out the responses of partners, even though they exhibit more confidence in their organizational adaptive capacity and situation awareness, one needs to be alert to the dissenting voices within that picture. This means that there are respondents that are not sure or disagree that their organizations are adaptive and aware.
Resilience Key Traits

Every fifth answer shows that there is an undecidedness related to how well organizations under consideration portrayed resilience in the past. Most of this undecidedness is contributed by the responses from partner organizations, as fund staff shows a strong culture of resilience that is embedded across its structure. The weakest points dealt with the perception of how focused the organizations were on responding to unexpected events and how deliberate they were in building the ability of their members to face challenges. The table below shows the overall responses to the questions measuring the resilience key traits.

Table 2. ARMENIA: Commitment to Resilience and Connectedness

| Our organization is focused on being able to respond to the unexpected when it strikes the organization | Our organization is concerned with building people's ability to respond to unpredicted challenges | I believe our organization is able to collaborate with other's in civil society to manage unexpected challenges | Commitment to Connectedness | Network Perspective Collaboration and Leadership Roles among other players were questioned. Partner organizations can ask questions related to how well they communicate their actions internally to all members and how they work across sections within their structures to make sure that people feel ready to face unexpected events. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Disagree | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Somewhat Disagree | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Somewhat Agree | 7 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| Agree | 8 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 16 |
| Strongly Agree | 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 14 |
| Don't know | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
Situation Awareness

There is a strong awareness of the situation among all organizations with a normal distribution skewed towards conducive perceptions. More specifically, fund staff have a stronger perception of situation awareness and identify no issues related to that. This suggests that most perceive their organizations as aware of what is happening around them, and what the information means for their organization currently as well as in the future. However, it is important to identify the early signs of possible weakness and work on them, especially when it comes to partners.

Figure 2. ARMENIA: Situation Awareness

The moderate views on situation awareness need to be addressed as part of improving resilience culture within partner organizations. More specifically, roles and responsibilities, recovery priorities, situation monitoring and informed decision making suggest carrying weak points as shown in the table below.

Table 3. ARMENIA: Situation Awareness Indicators

|                | Info | Formed | Decision | Making | Monitoring | Reporting | Recover | Insuranc | Connect | Underst | and | Analysis | of | Hazards | and | Consequen | Roles | Respon | Situation | Awaren | ses |
|----------------|------|--------|----------|--------|------------|-----------|--------|----------|---------|---------|      |          |     |         |      |          |      | sibili |            | ses     |
| Strongly Disagree | 0    | 0      | 0        | 9      | 0          | 1         | 2      | 12       |         |         |      |          |     |         |      | sities  |            | ses     |
| Disagree         | 3    | 2      | 5        | 17     | 3          | 4         | 7      | 41       |         |         |      |          |     |         |      |         |            | ses     |
| Somewhat Disagree| 0    | 3      | 4        | 3      | 2          | 1         | 4      | 17       |         |         |      |          |     |         |      | sibilities |            | ses     |
| Somewhat Agree   | 14   | 12     | 15       | 5      | 9          | 8         | 20     | 83       |         |         |      |          |     |         |      | sibilities |            | ses     |
The highest number of undecided answers in roles and responsibilities, combined with the fact that those that agreed or strongly agreed were less than the undecided ones, imply that roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined, or people are not aware of how these would change in a crisis or emergency. In recovery priorities, there is an almost equal number of those who agree and those who are either undecided or disagree that their organizations have clearly defined priorities for what is important during and after a crisis. This is the biggest contributor to vulnerability in recovery priorities. There is a possibility that there is a lack of wide awareness of what organization’s priorities would be following a crisis or emergency that is clearly defined. It could also mean that there is no deliberate and spelled out effort to understand the minimum operating requirements. The minimum requirements could be related to programs that would need to be sustained during the crisis or restart immediately after it or could relate to minimum inputs required to operate the organization, i.e. location, electricity, connectivity, lifeline services, minimum required staff, etc.

Armenian women’s human rights organizations have operated in the context of COVID-19 pandemic, the war and a reputational damage that was slowly accelerating from the late 2000s escalating into all out hate campaigns after the Velvet Revolution. It is interesting that after going through several unexpected events, some respondents are undecided on how their organizations have used these and other crisis-like situations to trigger self-evaluation and learn from adverse experiences. Unlike the previous case with roles and responsibilities, here most agree that their organizations have used the crises as triggers for self-evaluation. More specifically, there is a strong and clear agreement on learning lessons from past projects and making sure these lessons are carried through to future projects. However, when it comes to unexpected situations, the moderate voices that somewhat agree, create a gray zone related to the self-evaluation after the one-time event is over. This suggests that the organizations under consideration are very good at learning from planned activities but are not as strong when it comes to one-time events.

Finally, there is an almost equal standing if one separates the concurring voices from the moderates and disagreeing respondents related to the clearly defined priorities for what is important during and after a crisis. It paints a picture suggesting that participating organizations are very well prepared for business-as-usual processes but seem to need further improvement of preparedness for unexpected developments. The already occurred unexpected events can be used for reflective exercises to analyze how well the organizations were prepared, what could have been changed to better meet the challenges.

Decentralization, empowerment and trust are the building blocks of the decision-making process. Although most agree that staff capacity is robust and development is duly considered, there are still undecided members that are struggling with obtaining expert
assistance when something comes up and they do not know how to handle it. In a crisis, with an escalation of the sequence of events and high strain on the members, even small numbers can create high reverberations with tipping points that could cause organization wide disruptions. It is thus important for organizations to pay close attention to their staff development approaches and individual needs. This could also be a compound issue given the lack of clarity in the roles and responsibilities section, creating confusion among members about whom to approach with which issue. Finally, for smaller organizations it is more of a significant factor, that any number of members do not know whom to ask or how to act, as in emergencies that could escalate into entire areas of decisions getting stuck, waiting for the approval of the leadership already strained under a fast evolving sequence of events.

Finally, members in participant organizations are not aware of their insurance policy or strongly disagree that it would give them the needed support during an emergency or a crisis. The organizations need to ask themselves a question resting on their size, resources and legal environment that would find an answer to the sustenance and protection of their members and assets. Linked to that, once identified the right approach, the organizations would need to discuss it with their members before moving forward with adopting it as a policy.

Management of Keystone Vulnerabilities
There is an overall strong awareness about managing the vulnerabilities that are well depicted by the responses portrayed in the figure below. There is a strong perception that components in the organizational systems, which by their loss or impairment have the potential to cause exceptional effects for the system, are well planned and taken care of, and that is well communicated to the members, or the process was quite inclusive. More specifically, the strongest pillars of this aspect are the capability and capacity of internal resources, robust process for identifying and analyzing vulnerabilities, as well as staff engagement and involvement. Respondents are confident that during business-as-usual periods they are well resourced and can even take up a small amount of unexpected change. Another important factor is the strong perception of less bureaucracy, which makes it easier to act swiftly. Another factor contributing to resilience is the culture of reporting mistakes and welcoming this behavior on the part of the management. People are also well aware of how quickly they would be affected by unexpected negative events. This sense of ownership keeps people involved and they report feeling personally responsible for their organization’s ability to operate or the effectiveness of owning problems until they are solved.
However, the portrayed strengths mask vulnerabilities in areas that need attention as part of daily operations and commitment to resilience to avoid loss of infrastructure and ability to operate when things go astray. There is almost a parity in the perceptions if they are grouped into those that strongly agree and agree and those that are undecided, disagree or don’t know. Against 239 answers that agreed or strongly agreed with the statements under this dimension 149 disagreed, were undecided or did not know all together. Statements related to planning strategies, organizational connectivity and internal resources were contended and there is an organizational divide that needs to be addressed (see Table 4).

When looking at the results separately, the only weak point of the Fund in Armenia is that respondents are not aware how the fund relies on other organizations. For partner organizations the weak points are related to indicators of planning strategies, capability and capacity of external resources and organizational connectivity. Therefore, the below provided analysis of weak points is fully related to partners.

Being able to manage keystone vulnerabilities entails that organizations identify, proactively manage, and treat vulnerabilities that if triggered would threaten the ability of the organization to survive. Interestingly, more answers are undecided, not aware of or disagree with the way their respective organizations appropriateness of planning for the unexpected and preparedness for crisis through that planning process.
Table 4. ARMENIA: Management of Keystone Vulnerabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of keystone vulnerabilities</th>
<th>Planning strategies</th>
<th>Participation in exercises</th>
<th>Capability and capacity of internal resources</th>
<th>Capability and capacity of external resources</th>
<th>Organizational connectivity</th>
<th>Robust processes for identifying and analyzing vulnerabilities</th>
<th>Staff engagement and involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only two responses indicated their organization had a formal written crisis/emergency or operations continuity plan, most responses stated that there was no plan with a couple being unaware of. An equal number of responses confirmed or rejected the fact that their organization had done any planning for a possible pandemic. The deeper cut into it showed that most of the planning was done through a discussion.

In response to the threat of pandemic, our organization has

1. Discussed how a pandemic would be managed with key staff 12
2. Put formal plans in place to manage a pandemic if it happened 3
3. Did none of the above 6

It is interesting to then unbundle the definition of planning further in the context of organizations that have participated in the survey. There is a possibility that much of it is done through discussion and no formalization follows or precedes it. Interestingly, when asked if the organization has planned for any of the risks or hazards the perception was quite optimistic. The details are provided in the figure below:
When further asked about focal points in certain areas staff hold an inflated view about the reality. Leadership, i.e. most of the decision-making power holders report fewer numbers than staff. Members in partner organizations, the staff in all organizations, those that are above the age of 40 or have less years of work experience within the organizations tend to have inflated views.
Staff above the age of 40 have a more realistic view that mostly coincides with what leadership reports, while staff that are younger have very inflated perceptions. Finally, staff in partner organizations have more inflated views than the fund. More specifically, if we are to assume that management would be in the best position to know the assigned focal points, divergence from what they report would show either inflated or deflated perceptions. Another point important for preparedness planning is integration of staff that have less than 3 years of experience within respective organizations, as their perceptions are significantly divergent from what the leadership reports. In this case again, staff that are relatively new to their organizations report higher numbers of focal points for risk, emergency or business continuity management than the management.

Preparedness through exercises is another indicator that sends mixed signals and needs attention. While most agree that their organizations understand that having a plan for emergencies is not enough and that the plan must be practiced and tested to be effective, their numbers fall when asked to respond to the other two questions. There is a clear divide between those that agree or strongly agree and those that are undecided, unaware or against the statement that their organizations give space for them to take time off from their day-to-day roles to be involved in practicing how we respond in an emergency. More respondents are unaware of or disagree with the statement that their organizations invest sufficient resources in being ready to respond to an emergency of any kind. This mixed picture of what is desirable and what is observed suggests that planning and preparedness is not thoroughly managed and communicated. Most probably there are regular practices of crisis preparedness through functional, table-top and call out exercises.

The picture of external capabilities and capacity sends a rather negative signal, as the number of unaware, undecided, and disagreeing responses is higher than those that show agreement. The outside resources that could be harnessed during an emergency either through existing agreements or contracts or their availability is not mapped. More responses were on the negative side related to the ability of the organizations to access resources from outside of their organization if needed. There was more disagreement and lack of knowledge related to the existing agreements with other organizations to provide resources in an emergency. Finally, less of an issue, but still showing more dissent, was the statement about the organization’s having had thought about and planned for support that it could provide to the community during an emergency.

There is a lack of clarity on how well the organizations manage their network interdependencies and how they continuously develop the relationships to operate successfully and prevent or respond to crises or emergencies. Although most agreed that their organizations understand how they are connected to other organizations in the same thematic area or location, and actively manage those links, they were not clear on the rest. More specifically there was more disagreement that their organizations knew how they relied on other organizations. Most also disagreed that their organizations kept in contact with organizations that might have to work within a crisis. This suggested that there was both a lack of clear mapping and communication, but also possibly visible action.
Adaptive Capacity

Adaptive capacity of the organizations that show strong leadership and a culture which enables clear communication, good working relationships, and a shared vision across the organization is strongly present. The perceptions are quite congruent. The figure below shows a picture of strong innovative and creative culture, where people are able to constantly and continuously act to match or exceed the needs of the organization's operating environment in anticipation of, or in response to change.

Figure 6. ARMENIA: Adaptive Capacity

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is one area that organizations in Armenia need to think of possible ways for instituting change, which is related to salaries and incentives. Most disagree or are undecided about how clear the salary scale is and how reasonable the incentives are. Furthermore, when analyzed separately, the responses of fund staff show that only half agree with the practice of being encouraged to try different roles within our organization to gain experience. The fund staff is divided on the perception that people most qualified to make decisions make them regardless of seniority. When looking at the data, partner organizations have weak points related to strategic vision, information and knowledge, leadership and management structures, and healing capacity. More specifically, staff from partner organizations disagree that their respective organizations regularly allocate time from our day-to-day work to re-evaluate what it is that they are trying to achieve. This is related to strategic vision. In the leadership area staff is not clear on how the salary scale is defined and how the incentives work. In the information and knowledge area staff from partner organizations are not concordant with the statement that people know who has the expertise to respond if something out of the ordinary happens. In the healing capacity area, they are not concordant with the statement that leaders in their organizations find ways to celebrate success through ceremonies and rituals.
Psychological Capital

*Figure 7. ARMENIA: HERO Score*

On all four fronts of hope, efficacy, resiliency and to a lesser degree optimism, respondents from the Fund and partner organizations show very strong psychological capital. There is an observable group that moderately agrees with statements, ranging from 13 to 37 percent. Leadership overall seems less hopeful and optimistic than staff.

There are areas where the inner resources are depleted and need the attention of the members. Exactly half of the respondents have stated that to some degree they are not energetically pursuing their work goals. Those respondents that have agreed and strongly agreed with the statement that they pursue their work goals are all staff from the fund and partner organizations, except for two decision makers (i.e. leadership and board members) from partner organizations. Four are of ages 21-30, the other four are of ages 31-40 and 3 are of ages 41-50. Four were with their organizations for less than 3 years, 3 for 4-10 years and 3 for less than a year. For more than half of the respondents in this group the most recent emergency in their perception was moderately disruptive or not at all, for the rest it was very disruptive. Those respondents that have somewhat agreed or disagreed or disagreed all together with the statement that they pursue their work goals are 4 decision makers (i.e. leadership) from partner organizations, one staff from the fund and 5 from partner organizations. One is younger than 20, three are of ages 21-30, four are of ages 31-40 and one is of ages 51-60. Five were with their organizations for less than 3 years, 3 for 4-10 years and one for less than a year. For more than half of the respondents in this group the most recent emergency in their perception was moderately disruptive or not at all, for the rest it was very disruptive. More responses have to some varying degree disagreed with the statement that they usually take stressful things at work in stride. Finally, more responses have to some varying degree disagreed with the statement of when things are uncertain for them at work, they usually expect the best.

When looking at data of the Fund and partners separately, pictures converge. Fund staff have a strong will and confidence to succeed. It has a weak point in the resiliency front, where staff have trouble recovering from setbacks. The worst performance is registered in the optimism indicator. Fund staff are not expecting the best when things become uncertain. They are not always looking on the bright side of things regarding their jobs. They do not think that in their current job, things always work out the way they want. Coming to the
partner organizations, in the area of the will to act and find ways has weak points. More specifically, half of the respondents are juggling with finding ways out of situations that seem challenging to them and are not in a good shape to pursue their work goals. This has impacted on their confidence levels, but luckily to a lesser degree. For instance, half of the respondents do not feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution. One third of the respondents do not feel confident in representing their work area in meetings with management. Resiliency, i.e. the ability to recover from setbacks, has two major areas for concern. One is related to the recovery itself, as the majority (93%) find it difficult to bounce back. The other one is related to stress, and 65% have reported having difficulty managing stress. Finally, in the area of optimism people, more specifically 50%, find it hard to look on the bright side and during uncertainties they tend to not expect a good outcome. All have reported that things do not work out the way they want, which for almost half of the respondents has created a perception that things do not have a positive side, meaning that they miss out on the opportunities that challenges undoubtedly bring along with themselves.

**Recommendations**

**ARMENIA**

Armenian organizations can together map their connectedness that already exists and areas where they can pull resources together. A possible option that organizations can consider is to engage in multi-organizational Readiness Exercises and Disaster Simulations (REDS). Using the previous emergencies and crises, they can together plot the resources they used, the way they used them, how they communicated within, among and across, what was disrupted, how they handled it, who were the key decision makers ex officio or de facto, what were the things they missed at the time, but realized later that were key patterns to watch out for, what are the possible emerging patterns currently.

Although feminist non-for-profits have a collective and participatory approach and less tendency to create bureaucracies, nevertheless, some sort of a formalized preparedness and response plan is a good idea and a tool for further empowering staff and members to clarify their roles and responsibilities if crises arise. It would be good to engage in future scenario simulations and think about what are the key environmental vulnerabilities that can disrupt key infrastructure, resources and staff presence. One thing to consider is the location where people congregate and manage their operations. What are the factors that could disrupt access to the location, how high the risks are in each possible scenario and what are the alternatives to losing the location are some of the questions that organizations can think about together.

In the light of the need to prepare for future crises, it is important to look at which ones impacted the organizations and staff the most. One of the questions in the survey asked respondents to describe the crisis and how it impacted. Another question asked to describe
an anticipated crisis that they would rather not want to experience. Based on those responses, some of the preparedness planning and exercises that organizations can conduct relate to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Consider the all-out war from Turkey and/or Azerbaijan. Consider escalations in Nagorno Karabagh. What these scenarios are going to mean to the business-as-usual, what are going to be the disruptions, what are going to be the demands on the organizations, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>Consider a situation when financial resources are on the decline and the organization faces layoffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>Consider a scenario where there is a significant impact on infrastructure (electricity, gas, communications, water, roads, etc.) and space is lost. The records on paper and in computers are lost as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4</td>
<td>There is an emergency whereby the community needs your support, especially in delivering first aid items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at programs and operations separately and talking to key people on what got disrupted during the last crises is another important strategy to adopt. For operations it is important to look at couplings in the components of the operations system. In other words, it is important to see which of the operational processes, if disrupted, could create chain reactions and debilitate or fully freeze the functionality of the organizations. In this, it is specifically important to look at key suppliers or contractors with whom the organizations have had long-standing agreements or contracts and whose departure could create uncertainties. It is always good to look at scenarios of electricity and communications disruptions. In this regard, it is recommended to plan for location or an alternative workable arrangement, key infrastructure (electricity, water, communications, etc.) disruptions and what are some of the tactics that can increase the security levels of organizations. Can people work from other offices of partner organizations or is there an established practice of hybrid working arrangements that has turned into sustained culture?

Adopting a loose network approach among participant organizations could pool expertise and help members of organizations tap into the knowledge of the network. Joint trainings, retreats and cross-trainings conducted by staff open to other members from all the organizations of the network could gradually build the knowledge and understanding of where one can go when having a question. Identifying key focal points for the most important functions during an emergency before it hits is another important step to take. Discussing the learning needs of members is another step that organizations can take through their HR persons or operations sections for small organizations. Mapping will help
them to identify the resources or to plan for them in advance, also, considering its integration into future projects.

It is important to be clear on how organizations are going to insure their assets and staff availability during emergencies. In doing so, they can learn a great deal from the past. The organizations need to ask themselves a question resting on their size, resources and legal environment that would find an answer to the sustenance and protection of their members and assets. Linked to that, once identified the right approach, the organizations would need to discuss it with their members before moving forward with adopting it as a policy. Most of all, they would need to clearly communicate it to all the members.

Preparedness exercises are a good way to test the weak links in the network, as well as identify couplings that can get jammed or disrupted during an emergency. What happens if the top responsible of the organization is out of reach? How long does it take others to act? Where things tend to get stalled? A scenario can be enacted in an office setting with certain variables subject to manipulation to see what the emerging picture is and what are the key vulnerabilities in how people respond. Interlinked to this, it is always a good idea if there are resources to allocate for First Aid training and evacuations, which can be enacted after the plans are cleared according to the local legislation with the authorized agencies.

There are areas where the inner resources are depleted and need the attention of the members. Organizations can together plan retreats, motivational seminars, coaching and leadership practicums, inviting experts to help staff regain resiliency and optimism. Above all, the best point to start the process is to discuss the initial findings of this assessment with all the members in a structured retreat or workshop.

Finally, given certain variations in week points between the fund and partner organization staff, derived from the survey responses, below are some of the suggested actions that can be considered by the respective organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For the Fund</th>
<th>For Partner Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be good to plan for yearly learning needs of staff and proactively and in consultation with staff plan for learning opportunities depending on the available resources. It is also possible to consider open learning (training) online resources from reputable organizations.</td>
<td>Assign a staff member or the HR to map communication styles during general meetings in terms of who are the ones that always express their views, what is their function in the organization and who are the ones that either remain silent or rarely contribute to the overall conversation. Possibly meter and map the official written communication, as well as high frequency communication nodes in the team and weak nodes. Discuss with the management on the possible causes of weak nodes and lesser communicating parties. If needed, organize informal retreats, and bring outside facilitators to work on team building and receive feedback on internal communication expectations and shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After taking simulation of crisis scenarios suggested above (organizations can choose which ones) it is good to identify the natural leaders and thematic leads as a prerequisite for assigning roles and responsibilities (as well as backup for management) if unexpected events emerge and evolve.

It would be good to plan for yearly learning needs of staff and proactively and in consultation with staff plan for learning opportunities depending on the available resources. It is also possible to consider open learning (training) online resources from reputable organizations.

Dedicating an item on the agenda of one of the all-staff meetings that discusses the insurance policy or the absence of it is important. However, it would be good to discuss it when the management has some sketched roadmap on how they are going to mitigate the risks.

Thinking of planning joint retreats with key partners in the network could benefit the staff of the fund, as well as the partners. It can also create unexpected synergies among members of those organizations. One such retreat that can be organized can pick an emergency scenario as a theme for the retreat. This can also help the organizations to start devising their emergency plans after the retreat, keeping in mind the external resources, as well as the network of partners that they have and can actively rely on. This will also solve the unclear view of network interdependency both for the partners, as well as for the fund.

As organizations, the non-profits have legally binding requirements of reporting to their respective boards. The management can use this to build a cycle of strategic planning (including incorporating crisis preparedness planning) to engage the staff in the preparation process before reporting to the board.

The HR or the respective responsible staff member can be assigned with a task to systematize the salary scale and link it to the job description (based on skill and competence complexity). In addition, the incentives should follow a policy that should be clearly communicated to all staff.

Leadership training especially for those who are managers is needed, as the optimism and resiliency of the staff is greatly dependent on how their leaders present the situation and how they manage them. Inviting professional trainers or enrolling in existing courses could greatly benefit the
organizations. An example of one such activity is the workshop of Harvard University **organized** for their staff.