

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Assessing the Operational Capability of Disaster and Emergency Management Resources: Using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

[Ke Zhang](#) and [Jae Eun Lee](#) *

Posted Date: 26 March 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202403.1510.v1

Keywords: DEMRs; operational capability; AHP; evaluation index system



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

Assessing the Operational Capability of Disaster and Emergency Management Resources: Using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

Ke Zhang and Jae Eun Lee *

Department of Crisisonomy & National Crisisonomy Institute, Chungbuk National University, Chungbuk 28644, Korea

* Correspondence: jeunlee@chungbuk.ac.kr; Tel.: +82-43-261-2197

Abstract: This study aims to assess the operational capabilities of disaster and emergency management resources (DEMRS), which are pivotal in mitigating risks and minimizing losses amid the increasing frequency of disasters. The research constructs an effective operational capability evaluation system for DEMRS, encompassing four key aspects: resource planning, organizational management capability, resource support capability, and information processing capability. It focuses on identifying the factors that influence the effective operational capability of DEMRS in China and Korea, comparing and analyzing the relative importance and priority of each evaluation domain and indicator within these countries to enhance DEMRS' operational effectiveness. The methodology involves calculating and ranking the weight of the four domains, with findings indicating that organizational management capability is most significant in China, whereas resource support capability is prioritized in Korea. A comparative analysis of the local weight of indicators within each domain revealed the largest discrepancy between China and Korea in the information processing capability domain. The study concludes by calculating global weights, identifying fast response capability and resource allocation capability as the most impactful factors on DEMRS' operational capability, highlighting their critical role in disaster and emergency management.

Keywords: DEMRS; operational capability; AHP; evaluation index system

1. Introduction

Disasters are growing more complex and unpredictable, fueled by escalating urbanization and global climate change [1]. Every country worldwide faces unavoidable threats from both man-made and natural disasters, posing severe risks to people's lives, property, and socio-economic progress. One of the core duties of national governments has always been to safeguard the lives and property of their citizens from disaster impacts [2]. Given these multifaceted threats, it is crucial for governments to develop and implement a practical disaster and emergency management system.

The operation of disaster and emergency management resources (DEMRS) plays a crucial role in disaster and emergency management, directly impacting the effectiveness of disaster and emergency relief efforts. This involves the identification, acquisition, allocation, and distribution of resources to address the needs prompted by emergency and disaster situations [3]. The complexity of effectively managing these operations is heightened by the unpredictable nature, widespread devastation, and dynamic evolution of disasters [4–6]. This process is particularly susceptible to a myriad of uncontrollable factors, such as organizational challenges, human elements, material logistics, information dissemination, and environmental conditions, all of which can significantly hinder the progress of emergency rescue operations. To enhance the coordination of disaster relief resources and ensure the needs of emergency and disaster relief are met for government departments, identifying the key factors influencing the effective operation of DEMRS is essential.

Research in disaster management, emergency response, and emergency resources has gained significant attention from both government bodies and academic institutions. In terms of government practices, the United States pioneered the evaluation of emergency response capabilities and established the National Incident Management System (NIMS) in 2004, which includes guidelines for

emergency resource management. Japan has long focused on disaster response and recovery efforts, implementing an evaluation system for disaster prevention capabilities, including a resource management system, in 2002 [7,8]. South Korea (hereinafter Korea) has advanced in evaluating emergency management capacity, with annual assessments conducted by the Ministry of Administration and Security that cover disaster management tasks and the operation of disaster management resources [9]. In China, the emphasis has been on the issuance of relevant policies and normative documents. The National People's Congress of China approved the 14th Five-Year Plan in March 2021, highlighting the need to strengthen the emergency supplies guarantee evaluation system.

Numerous scholars have highlighted the pivotal role disaster and emergency management resources (DEMRS) play in effectively managing crises. Zhai and Lee [10] have underscored the critical importance of disaster management resources in ensuring preparedness. Similarly, Miao et al. [11] pointed out the essential role of emergency resource management in mitigating losses from natural disasters, while Kim et al. [12] have argued for the necessity of early preventive actions through disaster management resources to limit the extent of disaster impacts. Additionally, there's a significant focus on enhancing emergency rescue efforts through analyses of storage, logistics, and distribution of emergency resources. For instance, Feizollahi et al. [13] conducted an empirical study to identify crucial factors in emergency logistics, utilizing the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) to rank important activities for optimizing logistic operations. Ma et al. [14] explored how intelligent technologies influence emergency resource allocation using the entropy-TOPSIS method.

Despite the emphasis on the significance of DEMRS in disaster and emergency management, there is a noted gap in research on their operational capability, often with a narrow focus on singular indicators. This paper innovates by incorporating coordinated strategies for resource planning and organizational management capabilities into the evaluation metrics. Furthermore, in the context of the fourth industrial revolution, the support of information technology in relief efforts, alongside advanced technical monitoring and warning systems, has been identified as a crucial success factor [15]. Therefore, the evaluation of DEMRS' operational capabilities should also encompass information processing capabilities, addressing the need for a systematic and comprehensive approach to capability building. This includes strengthening institutional capacity and enhancing disaster management capabilities across human resources, science and technology, organization, and supplies, underlining the necessity for a multifaceted strategy in disaster prevention and mitigation efforts.

This study seeks to ascertain the relative importance and priority of factors that influence the operational capabilities of Disaster and Emergency Management Resources (DEMRS), and to explore how these factors vary between China and Korea—a gap not yet explored in existing literature. To achieve these goals, the research begins with a thorough review of existing literature and previous studies to pinpoint specific factors impacting DEMRS' effectiveness across four key dimensions: resource planning, organizational management capability, resource support capability, and information processing capabilities. Next, employing a combination of expert surveys and the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), this study refines and develops an index model to assess the relative importance and priority of various domains and indicators related to DEMRS' operational capabilities. The paper concludes by highlighting major findings and offering recommendations to bolster the effective operational capacity of DEMRS. It aims to provide theoretical insights for improving the operational efficiency and collaborative efforts of DEMRS in China and Korea, thereby offering ongoing support for the advancement of disaster and emergency management capabilities in both countries.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Disaster and Emergency Management Resources (DEMRS)

In 2023, the Korean government enacted the "Disaster Management Resources Management Act" to protect the lives and property of its citizens. This act categorizes disaster management resources as the essential materials, properties, and human resources required for efficient disaster management. Meanwhile, according to China's "National Overall Emergency Response Plan for Emergencies," emergency resources encompass a broad range of assets, including human, material, financial, facilities, information, technology, and other resources necessary to ensure the effective execution of emergency activities and the smooth functioning of the emergency management system.

Numerous scholars have delved into the realm of disaster and emergency resources. In Korea, Kim et al. [12] have categorized disaster resources into human, equipment, and material categories, highlighting issues such as resource scarcity, capacity, utilization, and response time in disaster management. Lee et al. [16] consider disaster prevention resources to encompass human resources, materials, equipment, and facilities mobilized during disasters. In China, Zhou and She [17] describe emergency resources as a broad spectrum of essential supplies, relief equipment, and basic necessities for emergency rescue operations. Qin et al. [18] differentiate emergency resources into response and recovery categories, based on their use in different stages of emergency management. Shao et al. [19] emphasize that emergency resources form the foundational support for disaster and emergency management, playing a crucial role in the success of emergency responses.

This paper notes the variability in terminology used by governments and scholars in both countries regarding resources critical for disaster or emergency response and system functionality. These resources, which include human, material, financial, facilities, information, and technology, are collectively referred to as DEMRs. DEMRs represent a comprehensive term encompassing various resources that can be quickly mobilized or positively responded to in a short time frame during a disaster or emergency. Effective disaster and emergency management necessitates the integration of diverse societal resources, coordinating all necessary activities to mitigate hazards timely and efficiently [20].

2.2. The Operation of DEMRs

Emergency response involves not just providing ample resources but also their effective management, which is crucial for making emergency responses more orderly and improving the overall effectiveness of interventions [21]. Establishing a comprehensive resource management process is key to aligning resource capabilities, enhancing coordination, and ensuring interoperability nationwide. According to the National Incident Management System (NIMS), emergency resource management involves the application of processes, personnel, and tools to orchestrate the use of resources such as personnel, teams, facilities, and equipment. Its primary goal is to help policymakers optimize the use of emergency management resources to minimize damage and save lives [22]. Kim et al. [23] have categorized emergency resource management into three main types: equipment, supplies, and human resources, further breaking them down into 11 collaborative functions including life support, energy support, facility emergency recovery, and emergency communication support. Miao et al. [11] highlight the importance of emergency resource management in disaster response, viewing it as a crucial aspect of building resilience. Rodríguez et al. [24] point out that the successful logistical deployment of resources to aid disaster victims heavily depends on the collaboration among various organizations and participants.

In this study, based on earlier research, we defined the function of DEMRs as the coordination among various government departments and social organizations. This coordination aims to ensure the rapid and accurate distribution of essential emergency supplies from areas of availability to areas of need, minimizing the time taken. DEMRs encompass a range of activities designed to enhance the effectiveness of emergency responses and mitigate the negative impacts of disasters. Furthermore, we contend that a comprehensive perspective is crucial when considering the factors and requirements of DEMRs' operations. Effective coordination between government entities, individuals, and organizations is essential for the swift mobilization of resources. Additionally, incorporating information technology innovations is vital for enhancing the operational efficiency of these resources.

2.3. Construction of the Evaluation Index System of DEMRs Operational Capability

The evaluation index system is a set of two or more indexes used to effectively evaluate the performance, effectiveness, or capacity of a specific system [25]. For disasters or emergencies, it is critical to identify changing resource needs in the disaster response environment and develop the operational capabilities of the DEMRs necessary to respond to the disasters and emergencies [26]. Improving the operational capability of DEMRs has become an important research topic. Cigler [27] defines capabilities as the assortment of financial, technological, policy, institutional, leadership, and human resources that government agencies must have to effectively manage all phases of emergency response. Kusumasari et al. [28] view resource management capability as a combination of

institutional resources, human resources, policies for effective execution, as well as financial and technical resources, underpinned by leadership. Consequently, assessing the operational capabilities of DEMRs involves a multi-level, multi-indicator approach that incorporates various factors for a thorough analysis.

The principles of objectivity, systematicity, comprehensiveness, and coordination in constructing the indicator system should be followed to effectively improve the evaluation results' credibility [29]. Based on national policies and literature review, this paper starts with the concept of DEMRs. It draws on NIMS resource management guidance, "Disaster Resource Management Act" in Korea and "Emergency Resource Assurance Plan" in China to construct an evaluation index system of DEMRs operational capability with four domains and 16 indicators, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of the evaluation index system of DEMRs operational capability

Domain	Indicator	Description	References
Resource planning	Policy guidance	Formulate and implement emergency response policies to provide a framework and principles guiding the resources operation in emergency situations.	
	Demand assessment	Evaluate potential demand in emergency situations and provide data support for plan formulation.	
	Resource operation plan	Develop clear resource operation plans to ensure effective allocation, utilization and monitoring of resources.	
	Funding budget	Establish funding budgets to ensure adequate economic support.	
Organizational Management capability	Command and dispatch capability	Effectively command and dispatch organizations and personnel at all levels, ensuring coordinated response activities.	
	Fast response capability	Respond rapidly, flexibly, and efficiently to emergency situations to mitigate losses and expedite post-disaster recovery.	
	Social mobilisation capability	Effectively mobilize resources and support from all sectors of society, forming a collective effort.	
	Communication capability	Timely and accurate information transfer between the organization and stakeholders.	
Resources support capability	Reserve capability	Effectively stock and manage various resources (material, equipment, human resources, technology, information) required in emergency situations	[2,30–32]
	Transportation capability	Establish an efficient resource transport system to ensure timely and safe delivery of resources to the designated locations.	
	Scheduling capability	Efficiently schedule various resources to ensure their reasonable allocation at different locations and times.	
	Allocation capability	Flexibly and efficiently allocate various resources to meet the actual needs of different regions and departments.	
Information processing capability	Early warning technology	Use advanced technological means to detect potential risks and threats early, providing timely and accurate warning information.	
	Information acquisition timely	Rapid retrieval and timely transmission of critical information related to resource operations to support decision making and effective operations.	
	information-sharing capability	Governments and stakeholders effectively share critical information about emergencies and resources.	
	Monitoring and tracking of logistics	Implement effective logistics monitoring systems to track and manage the transportation, distribution, and use of resources.	

2.4 Literature Review

In the realm of disaster relief, the efficient supply of relief materials is paramount. Zhang et al. [32] devised an evaluation index system that scrutinizes emergency logistics capacity from five perspectives: emergency information processing, organization and management, support, rescue abilities, and follow-up recovery. Meanwhile, Oh [2] delved into AHP to facilitate collective decision-making among local and state disaster managers for the judicious allocation of scarce financial resources, creating a framework to evaluate human, physical, information, and relational resources. Chukwuka et al. [31] undertook a detailed examination of the risk categories and factors impeding the smooth functioning of the emergency resource supply chain. On another front, Wang et al. [33]

leveraged expert opinions, surveys, and AHP to rank indicators for responding to natural disasters, advocating for increased investments in relief supplies, shelters, and preparedness initiatives. Du et al. [34] crafted a multi-level index system to gauge equipment support capability, blending qualitative and quantitative methods to ascertain the weights and values of various indicators. This was complemented by a fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method to evaluate emergency transport support capacity, highlighting its strengths and weaknesses. Wang and Zhang [35] presented a simulation and assessment model focused on the provisioning of relief materials in disaster-affected zones. This model assesses the humanitarian supply chain's capability to deliver relief and analyzes the decision-making and performance related to relief supplies. Furthermore, Xu and Gong [31] established an evaluation index system and model to appraise emergency logistics support capability. By merging subjective judgments with objective evaluations to calculate index weights, their case studies showcased the model's practicality and efficiency in assessing emergency logistics support capabilities.

Table 2. Result of Literature Analysis

Author(s)	Main Content	Remarks
Zhang et al. [32]	Developed an evaluation index system to assess emergency logistics capacity across five areas.	Assesses across emergency information processing, organization and management, support, rescue abilities, and follow-up recovery.
Oh [2]	Investigated the use of AHP for decision-making by disaster managers for effective resource distribution.	Created an evaluation framework for assessing human, physical, information, and relational resources.
Chukwuka et al. [31]	Conducted analysis on risk categories and factors affecting the emergency resource supply chain.	Addresses risk factors in emergency resource supply chain smooth operation.
Wang et al. [33]	Focused on prioritizing indicators for natural disaster response capacity and suggested response measures.	Suggested enhancing investment in relief supplies, shelters, and emergency preparedness.
Du et al. [34]	Designed a multi-level index system for equipment support capability using a fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method.	Integrates qualitative and quantitative approaches to assess emergency transport support capacity.
Wang and Zhang [35]	Introduced a simulation and assessment model for the supply of relief materials in disaster areas.	Evaluates capacity in the humanitarian supply chain and quantifies decision-making and performance.
Xu and Gong [31]	Developed an evaluation index system and model for emergency logistics support capability.	Combines subjective and objective assessments to determine index weights; demonstrated via case studies.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1. Analytic Hierarchical Process (AHP)

The AHP is a decision-making methodology that integrates both quantitative and qualitative analysis, introduced by Saaty in the 1970s [36]. This approach assists in extracting preferences from decision-makers by breaking down complex, unstructured problems into simpler, multi-level hierarchies. It facilitates pairwise comparisons to determine the relative importance of each element, leading to the ranking of options to guide the selection of the most suitable solution [37]. AHP is particularly useful in scenarios fraught with uncertainty and multiple criteria, finding wide application across government, business, construction, healthcare, and education sectors. In the realm of disaster and emergency management, it aids in areas like disaster preparedness [10,38], emergency response [39,40], risk management and resilience assessment [41–43], sustainability assessment [44] and emergency supply chain risk analysis [30,45].

This research begins with a review of literature on DEMRs and their operational capabilities. It proposes an evaluation index system for these capabilities, establishing a hierarchical model based on their interrelationships. Experts from China and Korea were invited to test this model, ensuring the index system's comprehensiveness. Following validation, appropriate experts were chosen for data collection. A judgment matrix was created using the pairwise comparison method, from which the relative importance of each evaluation indicator was calculated. The consistency of these evaluations was verified using the consistency ratio (CR). The study concludes by aggregating the

weights of the indicators at different levels to compute the overall priority of each, thereby identifying key factors influencing the operational capability of DEMRs. The detailed methodology is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1. The flowchart of evaluation of DEMRs operational capability

3.2. Establishment of the Hierarchical Structure Model

The hierarchical structure model for assessing the operational capability of DEMRs consists of three tiers: the target layer (first tier), criteria layer (second tier), and scheme layer (third tier). At the top, the target layer (A) is defined as the operational capability of DEMRs. The criteria layer is segmented into four domains: resource planning (B1), organizational management capability (B2), resource support capability (B3), and information processing capability (B4), each accompanied by 16 sub-indicators for a comprehensive evaluation. The full evaluation model is depicted in Figure 2.




Figure 2. The evaluation model of DEMRs operational capability

3.3 Construction of Judgement Matrix

Constructing a judgment matrix is a key phase in applying the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) method. To guarantee the matrix's reliability and to scientifically set the importance and priorities of the indicators, the process began by inviting ten Ph.D. researchers to review and adjust the indicators. Following this, a group of 22 experts in the field of emergency and disaster management was assembled, including 11 from China and 11 from Korea. Through an online survey, these experts created pairwise comparison judgment matrices. Their assessments were based on their expertise, knowledge, and hands-on experience, employing the 1-9 scale method suggested by Saaty [37]. This method allowed the experts to more effectively and quickly evaluate the significance and values of each indicator.

3.4 Indicator Weight Calculation and Consistency Test

In this study, we used the YAAHP software to calculate the weights of the indicators at various levels and to perform consistency checks on all the judgment matrices created by the experts. It is widely accepted among researchers that consistency ratios (CR) of up to 0.10 are considered acceptable. However, some scholars suggest that a limit of up to 0.20 can also be acceptable, but not exceeding that threshold [46,47]. Saaty [36] explicitly defined the calculation of the Consistency Index (CI) for a comparison matrix as $CI = (\lambda_{max} - n)/(n - 1)$. Moreover, he provided specific values for the Random Consistency Index (RI) based on the number of criteria being evaluated [37]. The calculation of the consistency ratio (CR) is then given by the formula $CR = CI/RI$. The application of the AHP model to evaluate the operational capability of DEMRs in China resulted in a CR of 0.072, which is less than 0.1. Similarly, for Korea, the CR was 0.098, also below 0.1. These results, indicating a high level of consistency in the judgment matrices, are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3. The results of consistency test.

	A	B1	B2	B3	B4
China	0.072	0.030	0.056	0.038	0.072
Korea	0.098	0.031	0.053	0.039	0.039

4. Results

4.1. Local Weight Ranking Comparison

Figure 3 presents the weight distribution across various domains in China and Korea. For China, organizational management capability (B2) with a weight of 0.427 was identified as the most critical factor influencing the overall operational capability of DEMRs, followed by resource support capability (B3) with a weight of 0.361, resource planning (B1) at 0.110, and information processing capability (B4) with the lowest weight at 0.102. In Korea, resource support capability (B3) emerged as the most significant factor with a weight of 0.358, followed by organizational management capability (B2) at 0.313, information processing capability (B4) at 0.250, and resource planning (B1) receiving the least emphasis with a weight of 0.079.




Figure 3. The criterion layer weight ranking of DEMRs operational capability.

Based on the judgment matrix, we can determine the relative importance of the third-level indicators compared to their respective second-level categories. For resource planning (B1), as illustrated in Figure 4, the importance rankings are identical for both China and Korea. Policy guidance (C1) holds the highest local importance, with weights of 0.425 for China and 0.312 for Korea, followed by demand assessment (C2) and funding budget (C4), with China's weights being 0.244 and 0.182, and Korea's at 0.279 and 0.222, respectively. Lastly, the resource operation plan (C3) has the lowest weights, at 0.149 for China and 0.187 for Korea.




Figure 4. The local weight ranking of resource planning (B1) domain.

For the organizational management capability (B2), as depicted in Figure 5, in China, the weight for fast response capability (C6) reached a significant 0.413, with command and dispatch capability (C5) also being crucial at 0.381. Additionally, social mobilization capability (C7) and communication capability (C8) were weighted at 0.142 and 0.063, respectively. Conversely, in Korea, fast response capability (C6) had a predominant local weight of 0.424, considerably outweighing communication capability (C8) at 0.244, command and dispatch capability (C5) at 0.218, and social mobilization capability (C7) at 0.114.




Figure 5. The local weight ranking of organizational management capability (B2) domain.

Regarding the resource support capability (B3), shown in Figure 6, for China, allocation capability (C12) with a weight of 0.451 and reserve capability (C9) with a weight of 0.325 were deemed most essential. Transportation capability (C10) and scheduling capability (C11) followed, with weights of 0.146 and 0.078, respectively. In Korea, allocation capability (C12) was also the most significant, with the highest local weight of 0.391, then came reserve capability (C9) at 0.291, scheduling capability (C11) at 0.217, with transportation capability (C10) receiving a lower priority.




Figure 6. The local weight ranking of resources support capability (B3) domain.

In the context of information processing capability (B4), as illustrated in Figure 7, China and Korea show different prioritizations. In China, the monitoring and tracking of logistics (C16) plays a pivotal role in information processing capability, with a weight of 0.358. This is closely followed by timely information acquisition (C14) at 0.305, and early warning technology (C13) at 0.298, with only a slight difference between them. Information-sharing capability (C15) has the least weight.

In Korea, the weights for timely information acquisition (C14) and early warning technology (C13) are very close, at 0.355 and 0.353 respectively, indicating that it was challenging for the experts to distinguish between their relative importance due to their nearly equal significance. Monitoring and tracking of logistics (C16) follows with a weight of 0.183, and information-sharing capability (C15) has the lowest weight at 0.109, indicating it is considered the least critical factor.





Figure 7. The local weight ranking of information processing capability (B4) domain.

4.2. Global Weight Ranking Comparison


The global weight ranking provides insights into how various components within the scheme layer interact with both the overall goal and the scheme itself, often referred to as the composite or absolute weight ranking [2]. These global weights are calculated by multiplying the weight of each domain by the local weight of its indicators [48]. For example, the global weight for policy guidance (0.047) was derived by multiplying the weight of resource planning (0.11) by its local weight (0.425). Figure 8 illustrates the distribution of global weights for indicators within the scheme layer in relation to the target layer.

For China, as shown in Figure 8a, the top four indicators were fast response capability (0.176), command and dispatch capability (0.163), allocation capability (0.162), and reserve capability (0.117), all ranking within the top four. Following these, social mobilization capability (0.061) held the fifth position globally. The second least prominent indicator was the resource operation plan (0.017), with information-sharing capability (0.004) being the least significant.

In Korea's case, as depicted in Figure 8b, allocation capability (0.140) emerged as the highest in global weighting, followed by fast response capability (0.133) and reserve capability (0.104). Notably, timely information acquisition (0.089) ranked fourth, and early warning technology (0.088) ranked fifth globally, contrasting with their ninth and tenth positions in China. This suggests that Korea places a greater emphasis on these two aspects regarding the operational capacity of DEMRs. The least significant indicators were funding budget (0.018) and resource operation plan (0.015), highlighting different priorities between the two countries.



(a)



(b)

Figure 8. The global weight ranking of DEMRs operational capability.

5. Discussion

This study delineates the relative importance and priority of factors affecting the effectiveness of DEMRs in China and Korea, offering a detailed list of influential factors. The findings highlight several key insights: foremost, the analysis of domain weight and ranking indicates that organizational management capability holds the most significant impact on the operational capability of DEMRs in China, whereas resource support capability is prioritized in Korea. Additionally, information processing capability is ranked fourth in China but advances to third in Korea, suggesting a stronger emphasis on the role of information processing in Korea's effective management of DEMRs. This could be attributed to Korea's advanced use of information technology, including big data and the Internet of Things, propelled by its early adoption of the Fourth Industrial Revolution technologies compared to China. Despite some scholars highlighting information technology as a pivotal element for DEMRs operational capability [38,49], this study's findings do not entirely corroborate their views. While information technology has become crucial for disseminating

disaster-related information since the advent of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, its implementation has sometimes failed to foster adequate collaboration between governments and agencies. This lack of synergy has occasionally hindered resources from being timely delivered to disaster-stricken areas [50].

At the same time, it appears that both China and Korea have underestimated the importance of resource planning in the functionality of their DEMRs. According to Hu et al. [51], following the issuance of the Measures for Administration of Emergency Management Plans, the Chinese government has made significant strides in enhancing plan formulation and implementation, improving disaster preparedness via drills and training, and strengthening local emergency management capabilities. However, these plans still face challenges, such as flaws and a lack of standardization. Bae et al. [52] have also pointed out the insufficient comprehensive emergency planning in Korea, with disaster management resources often being allocated the lowest priority in existing emergency strategies, especially when compared to plans focusing on economic development.

Furthermore, when examining the ranking of local weights across each evaluation domain, policy guidance emerged as the paramount factor in both China and Korea in the realm of resource planning. This aligns with findings that suggest effective policies can better prepare communities to respond to disasters [53], thereby enabling stakeholders to be more proactive and prepared. Given the pivotal role of policy guidance in the operational dynamics of DEMRs and overall disaster management, it's imperative for public organizations and policymakers to consider revisions to public policy and practices. Such changes should aim to enhance the capacity to effectively manage future disasters, drawing on the lessons learned from past experiences [54].

Concerning organizational management capability, both countries prioritize fast response as crucial. This underscores the importance of swiftly addressing the needs for emergency relief in disaster-stricken areas, highlighting it as a vital aspect of effective operation of DEMRs. During the evaluation of resource operations, the efficiency of fast response should be considered a key metric, especially in the context of urgently allocating resources to essential systems and the limited recovery time [55].

In the realm of resource support capability, both countries recognize the resource allocation capability and reserve capability as critical factors influencing the operational capability efficiency of DEMRs, with the allocation capability being deemed more crucial than reserve capability. As Rodríguez-Espíndola [24] has shown, the lack of rational resource allocation can result in poor emergency responses, even when resources are plentiful.

Significant differences were observed between the two countries in terms of their information processing capabilities. In China, the most impact was seen in the monitoring and tracking of logistics, whereas in Korea, this was less pronounced. Meanwhile, the importance of timely early warning systems and access to information was almost equally recognized by both. The stark contrast in land size between China and Korea, with China's extensive territory and the logistical challenges of transporting resources over long distances, necessitates the use of mobile information gathering devices like GPS and GPRS for resource positioning and real-time tracking [56].

Thirdly, the comparison of global weight rankings indicates that fast response capability, resource allocation capability, and reserve capability were highly valued in both countries, highlighting these three factors had a more significant impact on DEMRs operational capability. Furthermore, the capability for command and dispatch was rated more prominently in China than in Korea, securing the second position in the global ranking. This reflects China's disaster management approach [57], which is characterized by unified leadership and a tiered response system. In this framework, the government is responsible for policy formulation, decision-making, and the coordination of disaster management efforts. In contrast, Korea places a greater emphasis on the capacity of information access and early warning technologies, ranking these significantly higher than China. This difference underscores Korea's focus on the importance of information processing in resource management. With advancements in big data and AI technology, the management of information resources has become increasingly vital. To support emergency management decisions and efficiently manage resources, it's essential to swiftly and effectively collect, integrate, analyze, and utilize various information processing capabilities [58]. China could benefit from adopting Korea's approach, enhancing its collection of emergency information, maintaining alertness to

significant disaster signals, improving its information analysis capabilities, and ensuring the timely dissemination of early warnings.

In the global weight ranking comparison between the two countries, it was observed that funding budgets and resource operation plans were deemed less critical. These elements are integral to emergency planning, and as Hu et al. [51] have highlighted, emergency planning faces obstacles such as limited funding and underdeveloped strategies. Consequently, these factors contribute less significantly to emergency response efforts than others. Furthermore, in China, the capacity for information sharing was ranked as the least important, even more so than in Korea. This discrepancy arises because various departments, local governments, and agencies often operate their own information databases and systems without a centralized platform for sharing information. This fragmentation can result in the undervaluation of information sharing capabilities.

6. Conclusions

This study leveraged a specially developed AHP analytical model to assess the relative importance and priority of various factors and indicators impacting the operational capability of DEMRs in China and Korea, facilitating a detailed comparative analysis between the two. Both countries recognize the critical importance of organizational management capability and resource support capability, with fast response capability, resource allocation capability, and reserve capability identified as key impact indicators. However, the significance of funding budgets and information-sharing capabilities has been overlooked in both countries. A notable distinction is Korea's higher prioritization of information processing capabilities, with early warning systems and timely access to information being ranked significantly higher than in China. In contrast, China places more emphasis on command and dispatch capabilities within the operational capability of DEMRs.

This study not only sheds light on the factors that affect the operational capabilities of Disaster and Emergency Management Resources (DEMRs) but also pinpoints short-comings in existing operational procedures, proposing strategies for enhancement. For managers, leveraging the operational strengths observed in other countries can significantly enhance the efficiency of their own DEMRs. Effective DEMRs operation not only mitigates immediate risks and minimizes losses but also promotes long-term resilience and sustainability by preserving infrastructure, ecosystems, and livelihoods.

Moreover, our comparative analysis of China and Korea offers valuable insights into regional variations in disaster management priorities and practices, thereby informing targeted strategies for enhancing sustainability at both national and international levels. By identifying factors that influence the effectiveness of DEMRs and assessing their relative importance, our research facilitates evidence-based decision-making and policy formulation aimed at building more resilient and sustainable societies. Future studies should delve deeper into the variances in disaster and emergency resources across different nations, aiming to develop a more comprehensive and scientific evaluation framework. Such efforts will enable a more precise assessment of DEMRs' operational capabilities worldwide, contributing to the enhancement of global disaster and emergency resource management levels.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, K. Zhang and J.E. Lee; methodology, K. Zhang; original draft preparation, K. Zhang; writing—review and editing, K. Zhang and J.E. Lee; visualization, K. Zhang; supervision, J.E. Lee; funding acquisition, J.E. Lee.

Funding & Acknowledgement: This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2023S1A5C2A02095270).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Mu, Y.; Li, Y.; Yan, R.; Luo, P.; Liu, Z.; Sun, Y.; Zha, X. Analysis of the ongoing effects of disasters in urbanization process and climate change: China's floods and droughts. *Sustainability* **2023**, *16*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16010014>
2. Oh, N. Collective decision-making for developing emergency management capabilities. *International Journal of Emergency Services* **2020**, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJES-06-2019-0025>
3. National Incident Management System. Available online: <https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/nims> (accessed on 23 July 2023).

4. Wang, H.; Ye, H.; Liu, L.; Li, J. Evaluation and obstacle analysis of emergency response capability in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **2022**, *19*, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191610200>
5. Liberatore, F.; Pizarro, C.; de Blas, C. S.; Ortuño, M. T.; Vitoriano, B. Uncertainty in humanitarian logistics for disaster management. A review. *Decision aid models for disaster management and emergencies* **2013**, 45-74. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-91216-74-9_3
6. Ding, L.; Zhou, J.J. Study on food supply chain integration of epidemic outbreak based on AHP-fuzzy. In Sixth International Conference on Traffic Engineering and Transportation System, Hong Kong, 1-3 July 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2669327>
7. Wu, X. Y.; Gu, J. H. Advance in research on urban emergency management capability assessment at home and abroad. *Journal of natural disasters* **2007**, *16*, 109-114. <https://doi.org/10.13577/j.jnd.2007.0620>
8. Indrayani, E.; Wasistiono, S. The role of community protection institution in disaster management at West Java, Indonesia. *Jambá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies* **2021**, *13*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba.v13i1.943>
9. Kim, Y. H.; Kim, S. J.; Lee, Ji Ho. A study on improving disaster management evaluation based on the PUFA meta evaluation model. *J. Korean Soc. Hazard Mitig* **2020**, *20*, 101-110. <https://doi.org/10.9798/KOSHAM.2020.20.1.101>
10. Zhai, L.; Lee, J. E. Analyzing the disaster preparedness capability of local government using AHP: Zhengzhou 7.20 rainstorm disaster. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **2023**, *20*, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20020952>
11. Miao, X.; Banister, D.; Tang, Y. Embedding resilience in emergency resource management to cope with natural hazards. *Natural hazards* **2013**, *69*, 1389-1404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-013-0753-4>
12. Kim, Y.; Jang, D.; Lee, S.; Kim, S. A critical review of disaster management resource problems based on past disaster events. *Journal of the Korean Society of Hazard Mitigation* **2019**, *19*, <https://doi.org/10.9798/kosham.2019.19.4.89>
13. Feizollahi, S.; Shirmohammadi, A.; Kahreh, Z. Investigation the requirements of supply and distribution emergency logistics management and categorization its sub-criteria using AHP: a case study. *Management Science Letters* **2012**, *2*, 2335-2340.
14. Ma, R.; Meng, F.; Du, H. Research on intelligent emergency resource allocation mechanism for public health emergencies: A case study on the prevention and control of COVID-19 in China. *Systems* **2023**, *11*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems11060300>
15. Yadav, D. K.; Barve, A. Analysis of critical success factors of humanitarian supply chain: An application of Interpretive Structural Modeling. *International journal of disaster risk reduction* **2015**, *12*, 213-225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2015.01.008>
16. Lee, C. H.; Jung, W. Y.; Lee, C. Y.; Kang, B. H. Study on the Classification of the Disaster Prevention Resources for Effective Disaster Management. *Journal of the Society of Disaster Information* **2013**, *9*, 153-163.
17. Zhou, G.; She, L. Research on scheduling models of emergency resource. In 2011 Fourth International Conference on Intelligent Computation Technology and Automation, 28-29 March 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICICTA18209.2011>
18. Qin, J.; Xing, Y.; Wang, S.; Wang, K.; Chaudhry, S. S. An inter-temporal resource emergency management model. *Computers & operations research* **2012**, *39*, 1909-1918. [10.1016/j.cor.2011.07.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2011.07.008)
19. Shao, H.; Zhao, H.; Hu, F. A study on modeling and simulation engineering of emergency resources supply based on System Dynamics. *Systems Engineering Procedia* **2012**, *5*, 307-312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sepro.2012.04.048>
20. Norris, A. C.; Martinez, S.; Labaka, L.; Madanian, S.; Gonzalez, J.J. Parry, D. Disaster E-Health: A new paradigm for collaborative healthcare in disasters. In 12th International Conference on Information Systems for Crisis Response and Management, Kristiansand, Norway, 2015.
21. Mu, J.; Liang, L.L. Multi-stage emergency resources management based on supply chain. *Applied Mechanics and Materials* **2014**, *635*, 1780-1783. [10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.635-637.1780](https://doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.635-637.1780)
22. Wang, S. L.; Sun, B. Q. Model of multi-period emergency material allocation for large-scale sudden natural disasters in humanitarian logistics: Efficiency, effectiveness and equity. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **2023**, *85*, 1-20. [10.1016/j.ijdr.2023.103530](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2023.103530)
23. Kim, S. W.; Lee, J.; Jang, D. W.; Chon, J. J. Disaster risk assessment for the disaster resources management planning. *Journal of the Korean Society of Hazard Mitigation* **2018**, *18*, 387-394. [10.9798/KOSHAM.2018.18.2.387](https://doi.org/10.9798/KOSHAM.2018.18.2.387)
24. Rodríguez-Espindola, O.; Albores, P.; Brewster, C. Disaster preparedness in humanitarian logistics: A collaborative approach for resource management in floods. *European Journal of Operational Research* **2018**, *264*, 978-993. [10.1016/j.ejor.2017.01.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2017.01.021)
25. Wood, E.; Sanders, M.; Frazier, T. The practical use of social vulnerability indicators in disaster management. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **2021**, *63*, 1-14. [10.1016/j.ijdr.2021.102464](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2021.102464)

26. Kusumasari, B.; Alam, Q.; Siddiqui, K. Resource capability for local government in managing disaster. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal* **2010**, *19*, 438-451. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09653561011070367>
27. Cigler, B. A. The “big questions” of Katrina and the 2005 great flood of New Orleans. *Public Administration Review* **2007**, *67*, 64-76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00814.x>
28. Kusumasari, B.; Alam, Q.; Siddiqui, K. Resource capability for local government in managing disaster. *Disaster Prevention and Management* **2010**, *19*(4), 438-451. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09653561011070367>
29. Ravago, M. L. V.; Mapa, C. D. S.; Aycardo, A. G.; Abrigo, M. R. Localized disaster risk management index for the Philippines: Is your municipality ready for the next disaster?. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **2020**, *51*, 101913. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101913>
30. Chukwuka, O. J., Ren, J., Wang, J., Paraskevadakis, D. A comprehensive research on analyzing risk factors in emergency supply chains. *Journal of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management* **2023**, *13*, 249-292. [10.1108/JHLSCM-10-2022-0108](https://doi.org/10.1108/JHLSCM-10-2022-0108)
31. Xu, K., Gong, H. Emergency logistics support capability evaluation model based on triangular fuzzy entropy and Choquet integral. *Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering* **2016**, *33*, 435-442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21681015.2016.1155182>
32. Zhang, Y., Ding, Q., Liu, J. B. Performance evaluation of emergency logistics capability for public health emergencies: perspective of COVID-19. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications* **2022**, *12*, 1509-1522. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2021.1914566>
33. Wang, T., Yang, L., Wu, S., Gao, J., Wei, B. Quantitative assessment of natural disaster coping capacity: An application for typhoons. *Sustainability* **2020**, *15*, 5949. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155949>
34. Du, L., Zhou, W., Liu, H., Qin, X. Research on Support Capability Evaluation of Road Emergency Transport Support Series Equipment Based on Disaster Condition Emergency Transport Task. In International Conference on Decision Science & Management, Singapore, January 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2768-3_6
35. Wang, Z., Zhang, J. Agent-based evaluation of humanitarian relief goods supply capability. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **2019**, *36*, 101105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101105>
36. Saaty, R. W. The analytic hierarchy process—what it is and how it is used. *Mathematical modelling* **1987**, *9*, 161-176. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0270-0255\(87\)90473-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0270-0255(87)90473-8)
37. Saaty, T. L. Decision making with the analytic hierarchy process. *International journal of services sciences* **2008**, *1*, 83-98. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijssci.2008.017590>
38. Manca, D.; Brambilla, S. A methodology based on the Analytic Hierarchy Process for the quantitative assessment of emergency preparedness and response in road tunnels. *Transport Policy* **2011**, *18*, 657-664. [10.1016/j.tranpol.2010.12.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2010.12.003)
39. Ju, Y., Wang, A., Liu, X. Evaluating emergency response capacity by fuzzy AHP and 2-tuple fuzzy linguistic approach. *Expert Systems with Applications* **2012**, *8*, 6972-6981. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.01.061>
40. Zhang, S., Yang, Y. AHP Based Grassroots Emergency Response Capability Evaluation Index System Construction. *Scientific and Social Research* **2021**, *6*, 91-96. [10.36922/ssr.v3i6.1282](https://doi.org/10.36922/ssr.v3i6.1282)
41. Orenco, P. M.; Fujii, M. A localized disaster-resilience index to assess coastal communities based on an analytic hierarchy process (AHP). *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **2013**, *3*, 62-75. [10.1016/j.ijdrr.2012.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2012.11.006)
42. Yazo-Cabuya, E. J., Herrera-Cuartas, J. A., Ibeas, A. Organizational Risk Prioritization Using DEMATEL and AHP towards Sustainability. *Sustainability* **2024**, *3*, 1080. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031080>
43. Atmaca, E., Aktaş, E., Öztürk, H. N. Evaluated Post-Disaster and Emergency Assembly Areas Using Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Techniques: A Case Study of Turkey. *Sustainability* **2023**, *10*, 8350. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15108350>
44. Pacheco-Treviño, S., Manzano-Camarillo, M. G. The Socioeconomic Dimensions of Water Scarcity in Urban and Rural Mexico: A Comprehensive Assessment of Sustainable Development. *Sustainability* **2024**, *6*(3), 1011. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031011>
45. Jiang, J., Jiang, S., Xu, G., Li, J. Research on Pricing Strategy and Profit-Distribution Mechanism of Green and Low-Carbon Agricultural Products' Traceability Supply Chain. *Sustainability* **2024**, *5*, 2087. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16052087>
46. Canco, I.; Kruja, D.; Iancu, T. AHP a reliable method for quality decision making: A case study in business. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132413932>
47. Cox, A. M.; Alwang, J.; Johnson, T. G. Local preferences for economic development outcomes: analytical hierarchy procedure. *Growth and Change* **2000**, *31*, 341-366. [10.1111/0017-4815.00132](https://doi.org/10.1111/0017-4815.00132)
48. Lee, S.; Ross, S. D. Sport sponsorship decision making in a global market: An approach of Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). *Sport, Business and Management* **2012**, *2*, 156-168. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20426781211243999>

49. Zhu, X.; Zhang, G.; Sun, B. A comprehensive literature review of the demand forecasting methods of emergency resources from the perspective of artificial intelligence. *Natural Hazards* **2019**, *97*, 65-82. <https://doi-org/10.1007/s11069-019-03626-z>
50. Abid, S. K.; Sulaiman, N.; Wei, C. S.; Nazir, U. Building resilient future: Information technology and disaster management-a Malaysian perspective. In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, June 2021.
51. Hu, X.; Naim, K.; Jia, S.; Zhengwei, Z. Disaster policy and emergency management reforms in China: From Wenchuan earthquake to Jiuzhaigou earthquake. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **2021**, *52*, 1-9. [10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101964](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101964)
52. Bae, Y.; Joo, Y. M.; Won, S. Y. Decentralization and collaborative disaster governance: Evidence from South Korea. *Habitat international* **2016**, *52*, 50-56. [10.1016/j.habitatint.2015.08.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2015.08.027)
53. Boediningsih, W.; Afdol, S. H.; Winandi, W.; Suwardi, S. H.; Hum, M. Appropriate natural disaster management policy in guarantee accuracy of target post disaster assistance. *Prizren Social Science Journal* **2019**, *3*, 79-87. <https://doi.org/10.32936/pssj.v3i2.101>
54. Broekema, W.; Porth, J.; Steen, T.; Torenvlied, R. Public leaders' organizational learning orientations in the wake of a crisis and the role of public service motivation. *Safety science* **2019**, *113*, 200-209. [10.1016/j.ssci.2018.11.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2018.11.002)
55. Zhang, Y. L.; Chen, L. Emergency materials reserve of government for natural disasters. *Natural Hazards* **2016**, *81*, 41-54. <https://doi-org.libproxy.chungbuk.ac.kr/10.1007/s11069-015-2065-3>
56. Ji, Z.; Anwen, Q. The application of internet of things (IOT) in emergency management system in China. In 2010 IEEE International Conference on Technologies for Homeland Security (HST), November 2010.
57. Lixin, Y.; Lingling, G.; Dong, Z.; Junxue, Z.; Zhanwu, G. An analysis on disasters management system in China. *Natural hazards* **2012**, *60*, 295-309. [doi:10.1007/s11069-011-0011-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-011-0011-6)
58. Cheng, Q.; Zhang, S. Research status and evolution trends of emergency information resource management: based on bibliometric analysis from 2003 to 2022. *International journal of disaster risk reduction* **2023**, 104053. [10.1016/j.ijdr.2023.104053](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2023.104053)

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.