Insights

1. **Providers & Receivers per City**

- Most cities have 1–2 providers and receivers, suggesting broad distribution but low concentration per city.

2. **Top Contributing Provider Type**

- Restaurants contribute the most food by quantity (6,923 units).
- Indicates restaurants as key partners for donation programs.

3. **Provider Contact Info by City**

- Query lists provider details (name, address, contact) for a specific city.
- Useful for local coordination as presented in the table.

4. **Top Receivers by Claims**

- A few receivers claim the majority of donations.
- Suggests potential need for equitable distribution.

5. **Total Quantity Available**

- **25,794 units** of food are available in total.

6. **City with Most Listings**

- *New Carol* leads with **6 listings**, showing geographic imbalance.
- Indicates scope for expanding listings in underrepresented cities.

7. **Most Common Food Types**

- **Vegan (70%)** dominates listings, followed by **Non-Vegetarian (19%)** and **Vegetarian (10%)**.

8. **Claims per Food Item**

- Items like **Rice** and **Soup** dominate claims.
- Indicates preferences or higher need for staple items.

9. **Provider with Most Successful Claims**

- **Barry Group** tops with **5 completed claims**, showing active participation.

10. **Claim Status Distribution**

- Nearly equal split:
    - Completed: **33.9%**
    - Cancelled: **33.6%**
    - Pending: **32.5%**
- High cancellation and pending rates suggest coordination or demand-supply issues.

11. Average Quantity Claimed per Receiver

- Some receivers consistently claim large quantities, indicating possible over-dependence or bulk needs.

12. Most Claimed Meal Type

- **Breakfast** dominates, suggesting meal-specific demand trends.

13. Total Quantity Donated by Each Provider

- A few providers donate significantly more (e.g., **Miller Inc: 217 units**).

14. Top Cities with Most Claims

- Certain cities dominate claims, showing **regional demand hotspots**.
- Could inform distribution planning and outreach.

15. Providers with No Claims

- Some providers have **zero claims**, meaning unused donations.
- Indicates a need for better receiver matching.

Recommendations

- Launch **awareness campaigns** in cities with low provider/receiver presence to increase participation.
- Build strong **partnerships with providers** via incentives like recognition programs or tax benefits.
- Set **claim caps or rotation policies** to ensure fair distribution.
- Expand campaigns in **underrepresented cities** and partner with **local NGOs** for onboarding providers.
- Maintain **stock prioritization for high-demand items** like Rice and Soup to ensure availability.
- Highlight and **reward active providers** (e.g., Barry Group) to motivate others and strengthen the donation network.
- Reduce **cancellations and pending claims** by:

- o Implementing **real-time status updates**
- o Sending **auto-reminders** for claim pickups.
- Implement a **receiver profiling system** to monitor bulk claims and verify genuine need.
- Allocate resources proportionally to **demand hotspots** and strengthen logistics in those cities.
- Match providers with no claims to **active receivers** through **smart recommendation algorithms** in the app to avoid food waste and build engagement.

Limitations

1. **Mislabelled Food Type Data**
   - o Some food items (e.g., Bread as Non-Vegetarian) were incorrectly categorized, which can skew analysis.
2. **Limited Data**
   - o Only one month of listings; trend analysis may not reflect seasonal variations.
3. **Data Gaps**
   - o Missing information in the original dataset (e.g., claims quantity) affects accuracy of some KPIs.
4. **Behavioural Uncertainty**
   - o High cancellation rates could be due to reasons outside data (logistics, mislabelled food type, transport, quality).
5. **No Real-Time Tracking**
   - o Current setup doesn't account for in-transit updates or dynamic inventory changes.