



... emergency needs assessment branch

1st SENAC Advisory Group Meeting Report:

Summary of Meeting and Consolidated Thematic Reports

**Strengthening Emergency Needs
Assessment Capacity (SENAC)**

**14-15 March 2005
Castel Gandolfo, Italy**

1st SENAC Advisory Group Meeting Report

March, 2005

© World Food Programme, Emergency Needs Assessment Branch (ODAN)

This meeting was held to provide guidance on the SENAC Project with the aim of producing better assess emergency food needs.

United Nations World Food Programme

Headquarters: Via C.G. Viola 68, Parco de' Medici, 00148, Rome, Italy

ODAN Emergency Needs Assessment Branch

SENAC Project Coordinator: Darlene Tymo

Tel: +39 06 6513 3608

E-mail: Darlene.Tymo@wfp.org

SENAC Methodology Specialist: Agnès Dhur

Tel: +39 06 6513 3650

E-mail: Agnes.Dhur@wfp.org

SENAC Pre-Crisis Information Specialist: Jan Delbaere

Tel: +39 06 6513 3256

E-mail: Jan.Delbaere@wfp.org

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Union.

1st SENAC Advisory Group Meeting Report

March 2005

Table of Contents

I. The SENAC Project	9
II. About the SENAC Advisory Group	9
III. Purpose of the 1st Advisory Group Meeting	10
IV. Summary of Thematic Discussions and Recommendations	10
Theme 1: Role of Markets in Emergencies	10
Theme 2: Impact of Food Aid on Households	16
Theme 3: Chronic and Transitory Food Insecurity.....	19
Theme 4: Non-Food Responses to Food Insecurity	23
Theme 5: Pre-Crisis Information.....	27
Annex I: SENAC Advisory Group Terms of Reference and Composition	38
Annex II: Agenda for 1st Meeting of SENAC Advisory Group	42
Annex III: Framework for Advisory Group Discussions	46
Annex IV: Meeting Participants	50

I. The SENAC Project

The European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO) is funding a WFP project to *Strengthen Emergency Needs Assessment Capacity* (SENAC). The objective of the SENAC Project is "to reinforce WFP's capacity to assess humanitarian needs in the food sector during emergencies and the immediate aftermath through accurate and impartial needs assessments". To achieve this, the Project will:

- develop improved analytical methods, tools and guidance materials;
- strengthen WFP's field capacity by deploying 12 assessment specialists in its regional bureaux; and
- improve the availability and management of pre-crisis information in countries exposed to recurrent and protracted emergencies.

During the first phase (October 2004 to September 2005), the SENAC project is focusing on five thematic areas:

- 1) the role of markets in emergencies and the effect of food aid on markets;
- 2) the effects of food aid on targeted and non-targeted households (dependency and induced migration);
- 3) chronic and transitory food insecurity;
- 4) non-food responses to food crises; and
- 5) pre-crisis baselines and food security monitoring systems.

The project is managed by a team of WFP staff in the Emergency Needs Assessment Branch (ODAN), based at WFP Headquarters in Rome. A Steering Committee comprised of representatives from ECHO, DFID, GTZ, USAID and WFP guides the project, and an Advisory Group of external experts has been set up to provide technical expertise and advise on the five thematic areas listed above.

II. About the SENAC Advisory Group

The members of the Advisory Group were identified based on their expertise in the area of emergency needs assessments, and at least one of the five thematic areas being addressed during the first phase of the project (see Annex I for the Terms of Reference and Composition of the Advisory Group). The role of the Group is to:

- Advise on the issues, indicators, research strategies and outputs for the five thematic areas;
- Advise on the practical links at the country level between the pre-crisis information related activities, and activities in the other four thematic areas;
- Enhance the quality of SENAC technical studies by reviewing the findings of case studies and field research, and making recommendations for adjustments;

- Recommend partnerships with NGOs, other UN agencies and research institutes in order to fine-tune methodologies and ensure linkages; and
- Advise on relevant on-going research.

III. Purpose of the 1st Advisory Group Meeting

The SENAC Advisory Group was convened for the first time on 14-15 March 2005, two months after the project became operational. The objective of the first meeting was to provide guidance, within the parameters of the project agreement with ECHO, on a research programme leading to tools to strengthen WFP's capacity to better assess emergency food needs. Specifically, the Advisory Group was tasked with:

- confirming the key issues and indicators in each thematic area to be considered during the assessment process;
- advising on a research strategy to inform the development of tools and analytical methods to address these issues; and
- proposing possible tools and analytical methods to be used by emergency needs assessment teams.

Refer to :

Annex II for the meeting agenda;

Annex III for the Framework for Discussions on the five thematic areas;

Annex IV for the list of meeting participants.

The following sections summarize the thematic discussions and recommendations that emerged from the first Advisory Group meeting.

IV. Summary of Thematic Discussions and Recommendations

Theme 1: Role of Markets in Emergencies

Group Leader: Chris Barrett, Cornell University (linked by conference call)

Paul Dorosh, World Bank

Kisan Gunjal, FAO

Will Whelan, USAID

Nicole Menage, WFP (ODTP)

Baker Mukere, WFP (PDPE)

Dekha Sheikh, WFP (ODK)

Geert Beekhuis, WFP (ODD)

Sonali Wikrema, WFP (PDP)

At the onset of the discussion, the group agreed to have an operational focus as much as possible. This was aided by the composition of the group, with substantial involvement of WFP staff. The overall goal of improving ENA assessments and increasing their credibility was also accepted.

Discussions on day one focused on the key issues for research. The key issues suggested by the organizers were refined to some extent, as follows:

- Behaviour of Markets: Issues related to estimating size of food gap, *ex ante* estimates of private sector imports, consumer demand, identification of bottlenecks, reasons for lack of trader participation, etc.
- Effects of food aid on markets: Focus on market development aspects, effects of food aid on traders and market structure, implications for exit strategy of large scale food aid programs, possible effects of food aid on prices and other markets (labour?)
- Market based interventions: local procurement, open market sales, self-targeting commodities and cassava.

The Group also concluded that the time available for analysis and the data available in a given country or region greatly influenced the scope and feasibility of market analysis in an operational context.

The second day, discussion began with a brainstorming exercise of listing possible research topics, clarification of the ideas proposed, a grouping of the proposed topics/studies, discussion of the merits of each proposal and possible counterparts/institutional linkages, and a ranking of topics/studies by broad levels of priority.

Three high priority activities were suggested:

- i. revision of the EFSA handbook;
- ii. a simple model incorporating the price effects of shocks and food aid flows on private imports, production and consumption.
- iii. a baseline desk/analytical study of trade policies and regional trade in Eastern and Southern Africa, using the information already available through past research and data gathering (FEWSNET and others), collecting data on tariff rates over time, and the WFP internal data base on local procurement in the region over the last five to ten years (focusing mainly on maize, but including other commodities to the extent feasible). The objective of this latter study is to organize background data on market flows, prices and policies in anticipation of future needs if the region is struck by another drought.

Work related to market development was also recognized as very important, but this has a longer term focus, and is potentially more complex (little analytical research has been done on this issue). Substantial opportunities exist to collaborate with other

work, e.g. by building on CARE's market survey in Darfur (perhaps a follow-up survey?), analyzing how private markets in Ethiopia function as it moves from an in-kind to cash-based safety net (perhaps working with IFPRI and other institutions). (There may be opportunities to build on the work by Levinson and McMillan in their study of Ethiopia).

The use of self-targeting commodities in market-based interventions was also recognized as important, although there was some debate on whether a review of existing studies/material and inclusion in the Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) Handbook was sufficient, or whether more work was needed to increase the use of these types of intervention where appropriate. This area also overlaps with possible research work done by the targeting group.

The Group also recognized the importance of including good market information (not just on prices and flows, but on structure and conduct of the market, if possible, including numbers of traders, costs and constraints, etc) as part of the baseline pre-crisis analysis.

Thematic Group Recommendations

Role of Markets	Sub-theme: Markets and emergency food security assessments
Issue	Revisions to EFSA Handbook
Problem statement	The EFSA Handbook chapter on markets requires further material to enhance its usefulness operationally
What exists?	Draft Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) Handbook
What is lacking?	Typology for markets; measures of HH market dependence; special considerations of poor households; methodologies to determine how to determine if markets are working using cost data; basic analysis of price movements; early warning measures; self-targeting commodities for market-based interventions
Tools/output required	Write-up and synthesis of existing secondary materials
Proposed method(s)	Desk study
Partners	WFP staff; reviewers
Timeframe	3 months
	Sub-theme: Price and market impacts analysis
Issue	Analysis of price and market impacts of food aid
Problem statement	Standard FAO/WFP crop assessments do not include explicit quantitative analysis of price effects in estimates of private imports and food aid needs, frequently leading to over-estimates of volume of food aid required; no <i>ex ante</i> effects of food aid on and through markets is done
What exists?	Food gap analysis based on estimated quantities
What is lacking?	An analytical framework and a simple tool to provide <i>ex ante</i> quantitative estimates of food aid requirements and possible effects on markets, production and consumption.
Tools/output required	Simple market model (spreadsheet-based) including basic parameters

Proposed method(s)	Construction of model; simulations based on data for two selected countries
Partners	FAO study on import requirements
Timeframe	6 months
	Sub-theme: Markets in Southern Africa
Issue	Trade and Market Policies in Southern Africa
Problem statement	Regional trade flows are potentially very important for enhancing food security and designing appropriate food intervention options if another large scale drought occurs, but this information is scattered and existing WFP local procurement data has not been utilized yet for this purpose
What exists?	Scattered studies and data
What is lacking?	Summary of existing work, systematic compilation of changes in tariff and trade policies over time in various countries; compilation of database on prices, market flows; utilization of information gained in WFP's local procurement in region
Tools/output required	Analysis of WFP local procurement data; compilation of database
Proposed method(s)	Desk study; secondary data analysis
Partners	WFP staff in country offices; Michigan State University; FEWSNET; SADC; USAID RATIC; others
Timeframe	8 months
	Sub-theme: Market development
Issue	Market development
Problem statement	Food aid has the potential to displace private trade and negatively affect market development. When large scale food aid is withdrawn, what can be done to ensure that private markets can provide adequate supply? Also, procurement and distribution for food aid of locally important commodities such as cassava, to help develop markets (especially in Southern Africa)
What exists?	Little in-depth research; some case studies of negative/positive experiences

What is lacking?	Typology for markets; measures of HH market dependence; special considerations of poor households; methodologies to determine how to know if markets are working using cost data; basic analysis of price movements; early warning measures; self-targeting commodities for market-based interventions
Tools/output required	Write-up and synthesis of existing secondary materials Examination of feasibility and impact of cassava in food aid distributions
Proposed method(s)	Analysis of existing data; follow up surveys with CARE in Darfur?; surveys in Ethiopia on whether markets will supply food to areas where cash safety nets are being proposed to replace food transfers
Partners	IFPRI, CARE, university researchers
Timeframe	12+ months
	Sub-theme: Market-based targeting mechanisms
Issue	Market-based targeting mechanisms
Problem statement Why is this an issue/ problem?	Market-based self-targeting commodity interventions have been successful in some cases, but these mechanisms may be under-utilized
What exists?	Theoretical literature and case studies
What is lacking?	Clear criteria for when market-based targeting mechanisms are appropriate and how to implement such programs
Tools/output required	Write-up and synthesis of existing secondary materials; operational guidelines for when and how to implement self-targeting commodity interventions Identification of potential commodities for self-targeting
Proposed method(s)	Desk study
Partners	USAID, IFPRI?
Timeframe	3 months

Theme 2: Impact of Food Aid on Households

Group Leader: John Hoddinott, IFPRI

Richard Mawer, SCF UK

Max Merbis, Centre for World Food Studies

Thomas Schaef, GTZ

Alessandro de Matteis, ECHO

Jeff Marzilli, WFP (OEDE)

Mamadou Diouf, WFP (ODD)

Darlene Tymo, WFP (SENAC)

Sub-theme: Anticipation of food aid impacts	
Issue	<p>ENAs require analytical methods that assess <i>ex ante</i> expected impacts, positive and negative, of resource transfers - food aid and/or cash - on targeted and non-targeted households and individuals on the following:</p> <p>Lives: Mortality; Nutritional status; High risk coping strategies; Vulnerability to physical insecurity; Food consumption</p> <p>Outcomes where potential adverse impacts are perceived to be of particular importance:</p> <p>Induced migration; Labour supply; Income generation</p> <p>Livelihoods and longer term impacts: Asset creation and depletion; Coping strategies; Social exclusion</p> <p>These expected impacts are needed at both a general level, and also for particular groups within a population. The particular groups will vary by context; in general,</p>

	they would include children, women and other groups considered vulnerable
Problem statement	A systematic summary of evidence on expected impacts of resource transfers (food aid, cash) on these outcomes that could be used to inform ENAs is lacking
What exists?	<p>Answering the questions “What exists” and “What is lacking” is made difficult by two factors:</p> <p>Statements about the impact of food aid are haunted by “myths” and repeated claims that are not always supported by evidence of acceptable quality.</p> <p>The group addressing these questions was not fully confident that it knew what exists and what is lacking.</p> <p>Mindful of these caveats, it is perceived that there is <i>relatively more</i> information on:</p> <p>Mortality; Nutritional status; Food consumption; Disincentive effects on labour supply and income generation</p> <p>Some forms of assets and capital (e.g. food aid and schooling)</p>
What is lacking?	<p>Mindful of these caveats, it is perceived that there is <i>relatively less</i> information on:</p> <p>High risk coping strategies; Vulnerability to physical insecurity; Induced migration; Assets (apart from schooling); Coping strategies; Social exclusion</p>
Tools/output required	A systematic summary of evidence on expected impacts of resource transfers (food aid, cash) on these outcomes – both generally and for particular sub-groups - that could be used to inform ENAs
Proposed method(s) (Thematic paper/desk review/thematic evaluation/field testing...?)	<p>There are two possible ways of proceeding</p> <p><i>Approach 1:</i> WFP, in consultation with the Advisory Group, selects a sub-set of outcomes considered to be of primary importance. Desk reviews are commissioned that: review what is known about the impacts of resource transfers (food and cash) on specified outcomes; and provide plausible ranges of magnitudes (such as elasticities)</p> <p>Once these reviews are completed, a systematic summary of evidence on expected impacts of resource transfers (food aid, cash) on these outcomes would be compiled in a form that could be used to inform ENAs</p> <p><i>Approach 2:</i> WFP consult a wider group of experts (possibly in consultation with the Advisory Group) on “the state of knowledge”. Out of this, knowledge of impacts on outcomes would be grouped into three broad categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes where much is known about potential impacts <i>and</i> there already exist good quality reviews Outcomes where there is an acceptable body of evidence but there do not exist good quality reviews Outcomes where there is not an acceptable body of evidence <p>Based on this categorization, WFP would commission either:</p>

	<p>Brief “reviews of reviews” where good quality reviews exist</p> <p>Desk reviews on priority outcomes where there is an acceptable body of evidence but there do not exist good quality reviews</p> <p>Case studies where there is not an acceptable body of evidence on priority outcomes</p>
Partners	To be identified by the Advisory Group. Note that this wider group of experts could also be used to provide these reviews.
Timeframe	Reviews (under either approach) would be completed in time for the November meeting (with the possible exception of the case studies which might be started but not completed). Consolidation (the systematic summary of evidence on expected impacts that could be used to inform ENAs) would follow afterwards, taking approximately three calendar months

Sub-theme: Food versus Cash	
Issue	ENA require an assessment as to whether providing food or cash as a resource is more appropriate
Problem statement	A systematic summary of the expected or likely impact of cash, rather than food transfers on priority outcomes is needed to inform ENA assessments of the need for food or cash resources
What exists?	There exists a scattering of studies of varying quality
What is lacking?	There does not exist a sufficient number of studies of acceptable quality to inform decisions about the expected impact of providing cash rather than food
Tools/output required	A systematic summary of evidence of acceptable quality that informs decisions about the expected impact of providing cash rather than food
Proposed method(s)	Two or three case studies - careful evaluations - of the comparative impacts of the provision of cash and food
Partners	A partnership between research institution(s) such as IDS, IFPRI, Centre for World Food Studies (Amsterdam) or others (who would undertake the evaluation) and WFP who would be undertaking interventions using both cash and food
Timeframe	The case studies would be launched in 2005 and a progress report would be presented at the November meeting. The case studies would take approximately 12 months

Theme 3: Chronic and Transitory Food Insecurity

Group Leader: Stephen Devereux, IDS

Hisham Khogali, IFRC

Takashi Yamano, Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development

Phumzile Mdladla, FEWSNET South Africa

Eric Kenefick, WFP (ODAV)

Agnes Dhur, WFP (SENAC)

Sub-theme: Distinguishing between chronic and transitory food insecurity	
Issue	<p><i>In order to improve decision-making for addressing both chronic and transitory food insecurity:</i></p> <p>Undertake research on analytical tools to collect optimal information, indicators and/or scales to distinguish between degrees of chronic, transitory and vulnerability to household food insecurity, accommodating differing perceptions between affected communities, local authorities and aid agencies</p> <p>Improve knowledge on the effects on chronic, transitory and vulnerability to food insecurity for different livelihood groups, of various types and combinations of shocks, e.g.: economic collapse, natural disaster, conflict</p>
Problem statement	<p>Unclear concepts: terminology is vague and confusing</p> <p>Donors have policy rules for allocating resources between acute and chronic situations</p> <p>Unsatisfactory targeting for providing assistance to households facing different types and levels of food insecurity</p> <p>Implications for entry and exit strategies – need to intervene before the situation deteriorates to the extent that vulnerable or transitory food insecure groups become chronically food insecure</p>

	Optimal ignorance – focus on collecting the most relevant information when a shock is happening
What exists?	<p>Tim Frankenberger paper “Chronic and Transitory Food Insecurity” (WFP Background Technical Paper, October 2003)</p> <p>Studies, reports and evaluations by governments, agencies, etc. (IFPRI, World Bank, etc.) from countries where large assistance programmes exist for the chronic and transitory food insecure households (Ethiopia, Mozambique, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, India, Mexico, Brazil, etc.)</p> <p>Vulnerability Assessment Committees (VACs) country studies in Southern Africa and review of VAC assessment methods (June 2005)</p> <p>F. Cuny “Pre-famine indicators” book (1999)</p> <p>IDS work on famine scales (Disasters, 2004)</p> <p>ODI papers on Livelihoods and Chronic Emergencies</p>
What is lacking?	<p>Clarity on concepts (chronic, transitory, vulnerability)</p> <p>Clarity on operational tools, indicators and thresholds, shifts between chronic and transitory food insecure groups, and causes of these shifts</p>
Tools/output required	<p>Definition of terms for operational purposes and consensus among stakeholders</p> <p>Operational indicators and thresholds</p>
Proposed method(s)	<p>Desk review including recommendations for operationalizing these concepts and proposing indicators and thresholds</p> <p>Thematic paper on the effects on chronic and transitory food insecurity for different livelihood groups of various types of shocks and combinations of shocks</p>
Partners	<p>Partnership between:</p> <p>An academic institute (ODI, IFPRI, IDS, Tulane University, Tango etc.) and</p> <p>An operational agency (e.g. Vulnerability Assessment Committee, SADC)</p>
Timeframe	By September 2005 for both the desk review and thematic paper
	Sub-theme: Decision-making on assistance programmes for chronically, transitory and vulnerable to food insecurity
Issue	<p><i>Develop analytical tools to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine criteria to launch assistance programmes (especially in slow-onset crises), based on changes in household food security and livelihoods

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine criteria to phase out assistance programmes (especially in rapid-onset crises) • Inform decisions on the types of assistance programme that respond best to the needs of households, taking existing formal and informal programmes (e.g. safety nets or social protection) into account
Problem statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clarity on agreed criteria for launching and exiting assistance programmes for various household groups • Lack of harmonization with existing safety nets and social assistance programmes • Lack of guidance on the feasibility of designing different types of assistance programmes tailored to different types and levels of food insecurity
What exists?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Darcy paper “According to Need?” (ODI 2003) • F. Cuny “Pre-famine indicators” book (1999), and Ethiopia application (WFP 2002) • Donors’ policies on funding allocations for emergencies, transition (e.g. PRRO) and developmental situations • ODI paper on financing emergencies (2004) • Good Humanitarian Donorship initiative • WFP Executive Board Policy papers on Emergencies and Exit Strategies (2005)
What is lacking?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational criteria and indicators to take decisions on assistance interventions, particularly in slow-onset crises • Consensus on these indicators and thresholds between various stakeholders • Guidance on the type of assistance programme(s) to carry out, taking into account existing social safety nets and assistance programmes
Tools/output required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early indicators of severity of slow-onset crises and decision points to trigger an assessment • Clear indicators to inform decisions on exit strategies • Improved decision-making tools on emergency assistance programmes, taking into account existing “non-emergency” assistance programmes
Proposed method(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of emergency programmes carried out by both WFP and other agencies, in ongoing and past operations, and recommendations on indicators and criteria to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ trigger assessments ○ launch emergency assistance programmes ○ exit emergency assistance programmes ○ inform decisions on types of assistance programmes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Real-time action research, through consultations with governments and various agencies, on criteria and indicators being used to trigger assessments and take decisions on assistance programmes that may be carried out in Southern Africa in 2005/2006
Partners	<p><u>Desk review:</u> Partnership between</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An academic institute (ODI, IFPRI, IDS, Tulane University, Tango etc.) and An operational agency (e.g. Vulnerability Assessment Committee, SADC) <p><u>Action research:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SADC or WFP Regional Food Security Assessors for the consultations with governments and agencies on Southern Africa assessments and assistance programmes
Timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk review: by September 2005 Action research: by July 2005

Theme 4: Non-Food Responses to Food Insecurity

Group Leader: Peter Walker, Tufts (unable to attend)

Paul Hulshoff, UNICEF

James Darcy, ODI

Chris Leather, Oxfam UK

Annalisa Conte, WFP (ODAV)

It was suggested to re-title this theme to read “appropriate responses to food insecurity” in recognition of the fact that we are proposing that the research project investigates the appropriate combination of both food aid and non-food responses.

Sub-theme: The comparative advantages of food versus non-food responses

- Suggest calling this sub-theme “comparative advantages of different types of response to food insecurity” again in recognition that in many situations it is not a choice between either food or non-food but a combination of different types of responses that will be most appropriate.
- We felt that sub-theme 1 “the potential role of non-food responses to household food insecurity” would be investigated as a part of the “comparative advantages issue”
- We think that “multi-sectoral needs assessments” should not be a focus of the SENAC project. We agreed that the focus of this research should be on assessments and responses, which aim to have a direct impact on household food insecurity and which take place after food insecurity has been identified as a significant factor leading to increased risk of malnutrition, morbidity and mortality. We strongly support other initiatives which aim to improve the quality of multi-sectoral assessments which aim to assess the relative importance of food insecurity, the public health environment etc. in increasing the risk of malnutrition, morbidity and mortality, and thereby informing decisions regarding the allocation of resources between sectors. However, we do not believe that this should be the focus in this initiative.
- We define the types of responses which we think should be a focus for this research in more detail below but in summary, we propose a focus on the appropriateness of food aid and alternatives or substitutes to food aid (rather than a broader spectrum of responses).

Issue: What are the criteria that can be used in emergency food security assessments to determine the appropriate combination of food and non-food responses to severe food insecurity in different contexts?

Problem Statement

- WFP, as well as other agencies, have been criticised for the over-utilisation of food aid in response to food security problems in recognition of the potential

negative impacts of food aid (loss of income for traders and producers, population movements, sustaining conflict etc.¹).

- The over-estimation of food aid requirements frequently means that appeals for donor funding are dominated by food aid at the expense of other types of response².
- Some of these problems also apply to other types of assistance, not just food aid and some arise from the way in which assistance is distributed. It is necessary to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of different types of assistance, as well as different modalities of delivery³.
- However, there are very few documented evaluations which compare the appropriateness of different types of response to food insecurity and therefore we are lacking in criteria which can be used to inform decision-making on the mix of responses that is appropriate in different contexts.⁴

What exists?

- *WFP ODAN Emergency Food Security Assessment Handbook* provides guidance on identifying and evaluating response options (Chapter 9). The outputs of the proposed research would inform the further development of these guidelines.
- *Oxfam GB Emergency Food Security Assessment Guidelines* also provide guidance on identifying interventions.
- *Seaman & Leather (2003) Non-food aid response to food insecurity: How do we identify the most appropriate types of intervention through emergency food security assessments?* - provides a classification of different types of response and identifies information required in order to determine the appropriateness of responses.
- *Levine & Chastre (2004) Missing the Point* evaluates the appropriateness of food security interventions in the Great Lakes and suggests broad criteria of appropriateness.
- *ODI Review of Cash Based Programmes* (Paul Harvey)
- *ODI According to Need project* (James Darcy)

What is lacking?

- There is a need to develop more detailed understanding of what works to achieve what outcomes under which conditions and thereby develop more precise “criteria of appropriateness” which can be used in Emergency Food Security Assessments.

Tools/output required

- A description of the circumstances in which different types of response are appropriate
- A detailed definition of “criteria of appropriateness” for different types of response

¹ Young 1992, p 50

² Development Initiatives (2003)

³ Seaman & Leather (2003)

⁴ Levine & Chastre (2004)

- Types of response could be classified in a matrix according to the severity of food insecurity and the cause of food insecurity (accessibility versus availability)
- Analytical tools for use in the identification of appropriate responses which can be incorporated into future versions of the WFP/ODAN EFSA Handbook

Proposed method(s)

Scope of the research and conceptual definitions

Nota bene: The group used the Conceptual Framework on the Causes of Malnutrition in Emergencies to help delineate the scope of the proposed research project. Inclusion criteria for responses to be studied:

- As mentioned above, we propose that the research focuses on the appropriateness of responses which aim to have a direct impact on food insecurity, i.e. they increase food availability and accessibility for disaster affected households.
- The common operational objective of the responses investigated should be: to ensure that disaster affected households are meeting their essential food requirements and protecting their livelihoods within a 12 month period.
- The 12 month timeframe is intended to focus the research on people experiencing severe food insecurity. The target population should include those households that have become or are at risk of becoming malnourished and are adopting risky coping strategies as a result of food insecurity in the 12 month period.
- Therefore, interventions researched should have a relatively quick, direct impact on food availability and accessibility (within 12 months) thereby including some quick impact livelihood interventions (e.g. most seeds and tools distributions) whilst excluding longer-term livelihood interventions (e.g. most micro-credit programmes)

The group discussed at length whether the research should only focus on responses, which aim to address the impact of a one-off “shock” or should also focus on responses to food insecurity resulting from a long-term downward trend. There was an emerging consensus that the severity of food insecurity should be a more important criterion than the duration of food insecurity.

Exclusion criteria for responses to be studied:

- The research does not focus on interventions which may have an indirect impact on food insecurity such as public health responses.
- The research does not focus on interventions, which aim to improve food utilisation (e.g. food preparation materials, nutrition education, public health measures).
- The research does not focus on responses to the structural causes of food insecurity (e.g. advocacy on governance).
- The research does not focus on interventions whose primary aim is to treat or prevent malnutrition, (therapeutic, supplementary feeding).

Suggested classification of responses to be studied

A classification is provided in the paper by Seaman and Leather (2003)

Reducing or stabilising food prices (e.g. government subsidies)

- Stabilising the prices of commodities sold by disaster-affected producers (e.g. livestock off-take)
- Food transfers (e.g. free food distributions, FFW)
- Cash transfers (e.g. grants, vouchers, CFW)
- Non-food item transfers (e.g. hygienic items, household items)
- Productive input transfers (e.g. water supply for livestock, fodder, seeds, tools, fishing nets, etc.)
- Improving physical access to sources of food (e.g. road rehabilitation, transport services, security for access to farms or markets)
- Policy interventions to reduce or suspend obligatory payments (e.g. taxation, school and health fees) so that households are better placed to purchase food.

It may be necessary to develop further inclusion and exclusion criteria in order to focus on the types of responses that are most relevant to WFP and in order to keep the research manageable.

Classification of contexts and selection of possible case study locations

Clearly, the appropriate combination of responses will vary according to the context and therefore it will be necessary to undertake field research in a range of different situations. The Group discussed broad categories of contexts and possible locations for field research.

Type of emergency	Possible case study locations
Natural disaster – rapid onset	Sri Lanka and Aceh-Indonesia (Nota bene: ODI, WFP, SC-UK, Oxfam and other agencies are already planning collaborative work in Tsunami affected areas)
Natural disaster – slow onset	Drought in pastoralist areas in the Horn of Africa, e.g. Somali region Ethiopia
Protracted conflict – settled displaced and non-displaced populations	Darfur Somalia (NB. a good comparative case study because some people are receiving food aid, others cash grants and others CFW)
Protracted conflict – frequently displaced populations	South Sudan
Protracted conflict – refugee populations	Chad
Economic collapse	Zimbabwe
Other?	?

Other possible selection criteria for case study locations

- Where there are different types of on-going response
- Where WFP is undertaking its baseline assessments
- Where there can be linkages with the work of other agencies, e.g. ODI, SC-UK, Oxfam GB

Desk review

- To identify experience in different types of responses to food insecurity meeting the inclusion criteria
- To identify the circumstances in which different types of intervention were appropriate
- To identify the criteria that were used in the selection of responses

Real-time action research (case studies)

- To monitor different types of on-going response in order to determine what works in what circumstances and refine criteria of appropriateness.

Review of WFP Emergency Food Security Assessments

- During the pilot-testing of WFP's EFSA Handbook particular attention should be made to the criteria and methods which are used to assess the appropriateness of different response options and to identify recommended responses
- i.e. this will involve the pilot-testing of the existing analytical tools in the current ODAN EFSA Handbook

Partners

- ODI
- Tufts University Feinstein Famine Research Centre
- Food Economy Group
- Save the Children UK, Oxfam GB, ACF...

Timeframe: 12 months

Theme 5: Pre-Crisis Information

Group Leader: Nancy Mock, Tulane University
Maxx Dilley, Columbia University
Gary Eilerts, FEWSNET
Thierry Negre, JRC

Anne Callanan, WFP (OEDP)

Jan Delbaere, WFP (SENAC)

The Pre-Crisis Group (PCG) discussed several inter-related issues, including:

- A review of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Group
- Conceptual and terminological issues surrounding vulnerability, food security and food security monitoring
- Technical issues surrounding pre-crisis baseline assessments and monitoring, especially those that are researchable
- WFP management of food security and vulnerability information management strategies
- Operational issues surrounding implementation of SENAC Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) and Food Security Monitoring Systems (FSMS) activities.

ToR Review

The Group reviewed its terms of reference and also the assignment of tasks for the two day Advisory Group meeting. The team felt that the PCG's main charge is somewhat different from other groups. It has a more practical charge of supporting the design and implementation of the assessment and monitoring activities this year. We saw our charge as the following:

- Support the strategy/methodology/implementation for field assessment and monitoring activities directly related to SENAC - this includes both strategic, technical and operational considerations
- Assist WFP to improve the linkages among its related information assessment activities and also between these activities and contingency planning/preparedness-VAM, ENA, etc
- Identify research gaps related to assessment/analysis methods that constraint the utility of CFSVA and FSMS
- Identify opportunities on the ground for research related to all of ours and other groups.

Our group expressed the need to have a clearer understanding of WFP's SENAC program activity status. We wanted to know which countries were identified for field work, the methodologies being proposed, plans for technical support and training, timeframes, budgets. We also needed to have copies of the draft EFSA Handbook and tools in order to evaluate the linkage issue. We realized that we should have come to the meeting with these documents already in hand; however, the lesson learned for the future is that progress reports, design documents and related information on country activities should be available before we come to the next AG meeting.

It was also suggested that one of the activities of the PCG should be to review the methods documents and a sample of best practice VAM baseline analyses so that we could have a better understanding of current practices and proposed methodologies for the CFSVA and the FSMS. Also, we felt that the Group should review the ENA

draft guidelines in order to help ensure that the linkages between CFSVA and ENA are concrete and effective (continuity of information strategies).

The team leader also sees the possibility that the AG could suggest common standards of core indicators that are assessed in a standardized format across the CFSVA activities, to the extent that these include a probability survey component.

List of countries

Comprehensive Food Security Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA): Niger, Madagascar, Zambia, Angola, DRC, Nepal, Myanmar, Uganda, Southern Sudan

Food Security Monitoring Systems (FSMS): Ivory Coast, Burundi, Haiti, Central African Republic, Darfur, Afghanistan

The Group felt that the list of countries should be circulated to all groups and that all groups also should make suggestions regarding potential collaborations in country, both in terms of operational information activities as well as potential research activities.

Most of the membership felt that the country/field grounding of SENAC (most of the resources are in that category) provides important opportunities for a basis for research data collection. Research activities might be “built” from the platform of the SENAC pre-crisis information activities. For example, a small sample of countries might be identified for comparative research (possibly in collaboration with on-going activities of other AG members).

Technical Issues

Early warning/monitoring, comprehensive baseline assessments and emergency needs assessments are components of an “information strategy” to guide WFP programming. As such, they should be thought of as interlinked activities that are intended to provide timely and program relevant information. In the field, that is currently the aspiration of most food security/early warning initiatives, but it is far from the practice because of bureaucratic relief/development divides among the donor community and organizational turfism on the ground. It is very important that WFP keep this integrated information strategy vision as a guiding driver of its specific activities to the extent possible. Also, the field reality is that there already are important key initiatives which also will have technical approaches. WFP will need to have a deliberate technical strategy to accommodate and collaborate with existing partners and activities in the field. The Group felt that WFP should consider this environmental context more carefully than it is apparently doing, for example, in the selection of countries. The Group also felt that the scope and emphasis of activities in the countries should reflect gaps in currently available information to the extent possible.

The Group also considered that a conceptual framework “tool” should join the various information activities within WFP-CSFVA, ENA, FSMS. The Group strongly felt that the “crocodile” was more harmful than helpful and that what is needed instead is a basic framework which articulates risks, hazards, shocks, vulnerability, food insecurity, recognizing that different agencies and disciplines utilize these terms in

different ways. However, it is important that WFP have an internally consistent understanding of these concepts and terms, especially at Headquarters level, so that the specific information identified and collected will be coherent towards food insecurity vulnerability analysis. Annex 1 articulates one member's suggested approach.

The FSMS component will be particularly challenging for WFP, given that it has not been an area of comparative advantage for WFP in the past, as well as the significant number of institutional actors and approaches that are on-going in the field. It is important to develop a strategy for this component from the perspective of "WFP" niche in existing FSMS. Thus, the approach probably will be context specific; however, some generic advantage of WFP is its large network of food monitors, who could be more effectively used to strengthen ongoing monitoring of information such as community level observable indicators, market data, beneficiary negative risk management, sentinel site data.

Comprehensive Food Security Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA)

The Group felt that the first point of order was to define the purpose and use of the CFSVA. The purpose is threefold:

Provide information to guide contingency planning; benchmarks for measuring evolution of the situation, to make the process of ENA and CFSAMs more effective and efficiently, and to understand the dynamics of livelihoods, risk management/coping. The CFSAM should provide both quantitative indicators reflecting food security status (availability, access, utilization and risk exposure) as well as qualitative information about how the vulnerable and the wider social and physical environment respond to shocks. As such, the CFSAM is truly a comprehensive analysis. Though in many instances, household and meso level data is needed, household surveys are one piece of the CFSVA.

Some of the PCG felt that WFP should develop some element of deliberate standardization across the food security indicator set, perhaps selecting a small number of core indicators that would be measured in a consistent way across data sets. Anthropometric indicators were put forward and endorsed by some. WFP should consider adding mortality, so that a good mortality benchmark could be created for post shock ENA. Other indicators that were addressed included proxy dietary indicators. These are already quasi standardized in that most of the technical support to the baseline exercise is provided by three staff members. However, the analytical use of these indicators, together with other household measures to classify households as food insecure, requires further analytical work (a research project suggestion). The TAG agreed that it would like to review the array of schemes for classifying household insecurity by reviewing a sample of best practice baselines, together with any instruments used for primary data collection.

The Group also discussed the common pitfalls of baseline work. One is the frequent lack of attention to needed information for contingency planning. For example, integrating current status information with hazard threats and making projections about future food and non-food needs under various hazard threat alternatives. CFSVA data often does not adequately address contingency planning data requirements (total population counts available at lower order administrative units,

information about the feasibility of various program options - for example, infrastructure for cash transfer, information about diversity in dietary patterns and ways that these change under stress, capacities of local organizations to participate/implement response).

Another pitfall is lack of adequate determination of areas/populations which should be assessed using probability household surveys. The Group recommends that the decision of the population to measure should be made carefully based upon information about vulnerability/risks, structural poverty and other factors that point to areas of high food insecurity risk.

A related concern is defining domains and strata for CFSVAs and household surveys. Often, for CFSVA's ecological/agro-economic/livelihood zoning, techniques are utilized to characterize and profile vulnerability. Yet there is no clear evidence that these approaches do yield efficient and effective methods for determining food security ecological "systems". In addition, if used, the zoning methods should be approached in a consistent manner to the extent feasible. This is a researchable question which should be reviewed as a potential research activity under SENAC. Review of zoning practice and its apparent validity.

The Group also understands that donors have questioned the credibility of current baselines/ENAs. It would be useful to compile concerns and get specific complaints so that the Advisory Group can assist WFP to respond to these.

A key strategy for improving the linkage and use of information is to ensure it is collected and stored, managed in a geo-referenced data base in GIS software. The Group strongly feels that this will improve WFP's ability to link its data analytic activities, to more effectively analyze data (geospatial analysis, graphical overlay of layers). The Group also feels that the data itself should be public domain and on a web server in easily accessible forms.

Another recommendation of the Advisory Group is that more effort be made to strengthen the analysis of the baseline analyses. To date, based on limited knowledge, the team noted some areas where the analyses could be strengthened. These include better integration of survey data with other secondary data, greater exploration of the interrelationship of food insecurity indicators, and more discussion/analysis of contingency options/scenarios.

The team also discussed FSMS and concluded that best practices argued for simple and contextualized approaches. The key is to identify simple indicators that can give rise to practical ways to trigger various emergency, safety net and exiting interventions. However, this requires a sophisticated understanding of the food security dynamics in countries and region. Traditional EW/monitoring indicators include agro-meteorological, price (usually for just a small number of commodities), and anthropometric indicators. Dangerous risk management (coping) strategies are being experimented with in some settings. The Group recommends that a case study review be done of potential good practice systems. These should include only those where there is a clear linkage between information and action and also they should draw from the recent emergence of local level-community monitoring and response systems.

- Prepare baseline assessment: how things normally work.
- Manual on CFSVA to review? VAM Standard analytical framework, quite general common questionnaires? Please give to Advisory Group for reaction.
- The approach should be based on livelihood framework, but should take into account external risks and dynamics (identify them).
- Steps suggested:
 - Review of literature in food security and vulnerability, agro-ecological zoning
 - Expert consultation to have map of main issues
 - Take stock of existing information
 - Collect secondary data available that fills in the framework
 - Identify gaps in food security analysis
 - Perform primary data collection for priority gaps, regions, groups
 - According to costs and resources, plan extent of work and scope
 - Implementation
- Integration needed with existing data, projects, e.g. integrate WFP/SENAC and FAO/FIVIMS and FEWSNET in Sudan. Go outside of the emergency world (poverty).
- Should give reference data for Crop and Food Supply Assessment Missions: production statistics, imports, exports, prices, stocks, consumption rates, etc.
- Make results, information freely available to humanitarian aid and development community.
- Get more information on dietary patterns in normal conditions.
- Clearly express timescale and budget for CSFVA. Scale and accuracy of baseline are conditioned by that.
- Common standard for database, spatial data, geo-referencing. Inter-operability with other systems. Information to be stored in spatial data base.
- Coordination to be ensured with other four groups. Give them field work opportunity when primary data collected. Geospatial presentation and analysis.
- Beware of lists of indicators; systems have to be adapted to national conditions.

Food Security Monitoring Systems (FSMS)

- A lot of on-going activities. WFP not leader in this field. Should be a collaborative activity with other agencies, systems: FAO, FEWS, etc.
- Taking stock of existing food security information systems and existing CFSVAs.

- Identify for each country piece to add to existing food security monitoring systems (coping, market, etc). Be practical and operational in limited project timeframe.
 - Identify simple indicators key to food security (maize price in Malawi).
 - Taking Malawi as case study to learn lessons?
 - Build on staff present in the field.
 - Household access indicators important as additional indicators to existing systems
- CFSVA
- Need for WFP to strengthen mainly household level food gap assessment. Quite strong in assessment of shocks and political environment
 - CFSVA should include at risk area analysis, outside risks, political and institutional environment at national and better regional level
 - Information possibly to be stored in spatial data base GIS. VAM to give the tool to do that in country. Interoperability with outside world. Access to information from web.
 - Need for a certain number of countries to update info, for others no data

Table 1 (below)

What types of information? Market risk management strategy political institutional physical socio economical environment, households and livelihoods, etc. then define indicators.

Validity as first step, for monitoring purposes, of food diversity as a proxy for food intake and meal frequency indicator. More research needed in pre-crisis food consumption assessment. Combine, for vulnerability, with livelihood indicators.

Last point more for monitoring purposes or operations – cancel.

Table 2 (below)

Bullet 2: response should be triggered by early warnings. It is impossible to give complete list with thresholds, specific to countries. Meteo, satellite data, market prices, nutrition status, but also political decisions, macro environment.

Operational issues:

What is the comparative advantage of WFP, what is it bringing to the table?

Necessity to articulate with systems in place, in particular with same donor funded systems.

Senior person to step in first to identify how the contribution can fit into the existing pictures, groups in place agencies, NGOs, government.

Pre-Crisis Information Note

Maxx Dilley

15 March 2005

One of the CFSVA's main tasks is to identify which households are vulnerable to what could cause them to become food insecure. For households that are already food insecure, the CFSVA tries to identify how food insecure, and why.

Risk factors fall into two groups. The first is variables in the external environment, economy, or society whose fluctuations can either push households towards (or help them avoid) food insecurity. External risk factors could be droughts, conflicts, border closings, agricultural failures, or food price increases, for example. The second group of risk factors is the characteristics of the households themselves that make them vulnerable to external events. By understanding how different households would be affected differently by external pressures to which they are likely to be exposed, the CFSVA can assess who is at risk of becoming food insecure, and why, to guide assistance.

When assessing, analyzing and documenting food insecurity conditions, the degree of food security should be stated in terms of either how high the risk is of particular households becoming food insecure or else how food insecure they actually are. Supporting the assessment requires identifying the specific external causal factors present, or potentially present, as well as the specific vulnerability factors that differentiate how different households will respond, i.e. the phrase "vulnerable to ..." should always be completed by naming external causal factors. By specifying how vulnerable different households are to likely or actual external threats, and why, an actionable assessment of food insecurity or the risks of food insecurity can be obtained.

Emergencies are acute instances of "realized risk", in which latent environmental or socio-economic risk factors combine with the vulnerability of exposed elements to create widespread losses, often across multiple sectors of the economy. In such cases, food security conditions can change very rapidly. Pre-crisis baselines help to identify how households sought food security prior to the emergency, and how successfully. Having this information allows emergency needs assessments to be undertaken based on an understanding of how households obtained food prior to the crisis. This knowledge helps focus the needs assessment and enhances the prospects of restoring and strengthening food security through the emergency response.

Thematic Group Recommendations

Sub-theme: Indicators	
Issue	Operational measures of dietary consumption for baseline assessment and monitoring
Problem statement	Dietary consumption is a key indicator of food insecurity
What exists?	Frequency and dietary diversity measures
What is lacking?	How to summarize and utilize these measures for food insecurity profiling
Tools/output required	Tool which includes question items, analysis and use recommendations
Proposed method(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review of current methods utilized for collection and summary of indicators by WFP - Partner in countries where quantitative studies are being undertaken by research institutions
Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research universities and government institutes, MSU, IFPRI, IDS, etc
Timeframe	
Sub-theme: Zoning	
Issue	Zoning is utilized as a key stratification factor for vulnerability profiling
Problem statement	Are we doing an adequate job of zoning?
What exists?	Approaches using agro-ecology, livelihoods, economic
What is lacking?	Review of zoning approaches and assessment of validity of these approaches
Tools/output required	Update of current approach
Proposed method(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review, desk study of approaches

	- Analysis of zone homogeneity from appropriate data
Partners	- Universities
Timeframe	
Sub-theme: Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA)	
Issue	Review of guidelines and lessons from past baselines
Problem statement	Need to review current practices and guidelines; scope and comprehensiveness of content; appropriateness of methods; universe and domain identification for sampling; usability of data: informs monitoring, informs contingency planning, analytic and display methods
What exists?	Draft guidelines, several baseline reports
What is lacking?	Systematic review of what has been done
Tools/output required	Tool which includes question items, analysis and use recommendations
Proposed method(s)	- Desk review of current methods utilized for collection and summary of indicators by WFP - Partner in countries where quantitative studies are being undertaken by research institutions
Partners	- Research universities and government institutes, MSU, IFPRI, IDS, etc
Time frame	
Sub-theme: selection of indicators and cut-off points	
Issue	Lack of widespread examples of simple and action oriented early warning/monitoring systems
Problem statement?	Need simple practical monitoring approaches
What exists?	A few examples of cases - Malawi, other??
What is lacking?	Systematic review of good practices
Tools/output required	Tool for characteristics of an FSMS
Proposed method(s)	poll field for good case study examples; comparative case study
Partners	- Research universities and government institutes, MSU, IFPRI, IDS, etc

Time frame	
------------	--

Market information:

The Advisory Sub-Group focusing on research issues related to markets suggested that the following issue be considered under the Pre-Crisis theme:

Sub-theme: Marketing information on structure, conduct, performance and policies for staple food commodities

Issue	Availability of basic marketing information on staple food commodities in selected developing countries
Problem statement	Rapid assessment missions conducting emergency needs assessments usually do not have enough time to collect and evaluate the full set of market information (basic marketing structure, conduct, performance and policies information for staple food commodities). It would be extremely helpful to have this basic information ready for such missions.
What exists?	To be identified
What is lacking?	Basic pre-crisis information on market structure, conduct, performance and policies for staple food commodities
Tools/output required	Collection and record of basic marketing information on staple food commodities in selected developing countries (baseline study countries)
Proposed method(s)	Secondary and primary data collection
Partners	WFP staff in country offices; others
Timeframe	8 months?

Annex I: SENAC Advisory Group Terms of Reference and Composition

1. Introduction

In October 2004, WFP launched an ECHO-funded project to “Strengthen Emergency Needs Assessment Capacity” (SENAC). The aim is to strengthen WFP’s capacity to assess humanitarian needs in the food sector during emergencies and the immediate aftermath through accurate and impartial needs assessments. This includes developing organizational capacity, analytical methods, and data at both national and household levels. The initial phase of the SENAC project is one year, with a possible extension of up to 30 months.

The project is guided by a Technical Committee comprised of donor representatives, which oversees the workplan and monitors progress. The project will also have an Advisory Group to provide substantive guidance on the research being undertaken in key areas related to emergency needs assessments, and to advise on coordination with related efforts elsewhere.

During the first year, the Advisory Group will focus on five thematic areas 1) the *role of markets* in emergencies and the effect of food aid on markets, 2) the effects and *impact of food aid* on targeted and non-targeted households, 3) *chronic versus transitory* food insecurity, 4) *non-food responses* to food crises and multi-sectoral assessment approaches, and 5) baselines and *pre-crisis information* systems. Additional themes will be added during the second year.

2. Composition of the Advisory Group

Members of the Advisory Group will be selected based on their expertise as related to emergency needs assessments and the five key themes being addressed during the first year. The Advisory Group will have a mix of representatives from academia, government (both recipient and donor), non-governmental organizations and other UN bodies, with not more than 4 members in each thematic area to ensure efficiency.

Secretariat

The WFP headquarters-based project team, comprised of the Project Coordinator, Food Security Methodology Specialist, and Crisis Information Specialist will constitute the Secretariat to the Advisory Group. The Secretariat will be responsible for preparing the meetings and ensuring on-going communication.

WFP Observers / facilitators

Emergency Needs Assessment Branch (ODAN):

Wolfgang Herbringer, Chief; Nicole Steyer, Alternate

Vulnerability, Analyses and Mapping Branch (VAM):

Annalisa Conte, Chief; Eric Kenefick, Alternate

3. Functions of the Advisory Group

The Advisory Group is complementary to the Technical Committee. The Advisory Group will present the Technical Committee with appraisals and recommendations on the five thematic areas. The Chair of the Advisory Group will lead the meetings and ensure coordination between the thematic groups.

Specifically, the Advisory Group will:

- a. advise on the issues, indicators, research strategy and outputs for the following five themes: (1) the role of markets in emergencies and the effect of food aid on markets; (2) the effects and impact of food aid; (3) chronic vs. transitory food insecurity; (4) non-food responses to food crises and multi-sectoral assessment approaches; and (5) pre-crisis information;
- b. advise on the practical links at the country-level between the pre-crisis information related activities, and activities in the other four thematic areas;
- c. enhance the quality of the project's technical studies by reviewing the findings of case studies and field research and making recommendations for adjustments;
- d. recommend partnerships with NGOs, other UN agencies and research institutes in order to fine-tune methodologies and ensure linkages; and
- e. advise on relevant on-going international research.

4. Operational Modalities

The Advisory Group will meet twice in 2005 (the first phase of ECHO funding). The first meeting is proposed for March, and the second for late October. The timing will preferably correspond to the dates of Technical Committee meetings. An additional meeting of each thematic sub-group should take place physically or virtually depending on progress in the respective thematic area.

The Secretariat to the Advisory Group will ensure that all documents and feedback are transmitted in due time and format before and after the meetings. The Secretariat will also provide the communication link between the members of the thematic sub-groups and the 12 WFP regional office-based needs assessment specialists. To the extent possible, all SENAC project staff should participate in the Advisory Group meetings.

5. Indicative Time Commitment of Advisory Group Members

- Two meetings during 2005 (tentatively March and November). For each meeting, it is anticipated that some preparation will be required in terms of reviewing research programmes, proposed methodologies and draft case study reports and/or guidelines.
- In addition, Advisory Group members will also be consulted “virtually” during the project by the project team.

- Total commitment requested from each Advisory Group member: 15 days during 2005 (which includes participation in meetings)

Composition of the Advisory Group (by thematic sub-group)

Chair

James Darcy, Overseas Development Institute

A. Role of Markets

Chris Barrett, Cornell University

Paul Dorosh, World Bank (*alternate chair*)

Henri Josserand, FAO Rome (*alternate Kisan Gunjal, FAO*)

Eleni Gabre-Madhin, IFPRI Ethiopia

B. Impact of food aid

John Hoddinott, IFPRI

Richard Mawer, SCF UK

Max Merbis, Center for World Food Studies, Amsterdam

Howard Standen, CARE USA

C. Chronic vs transitory

Stephen Devereux, IDS

Takashi Yamano, Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development, Tokyo

Phumzile Mdladla, FEWSNET South Africa

Hisham Khogali, IFRC

D. Non-food responses

Peter Walker, Tufts University

Chris Leather, OXFAM UK

Andre Griekspoor, WHO

Paul Hulshoff, UNICEF

E. Crisis information

Nancy Mock, Tulane University

Maxx Dilley, Columbia University

Gary Eilerts, FEWSNET

Thierry Negre, JRC

Annex II: Agenda for 1st Meeting of SENAC Advisory Group

Draft: 9march05

Strengthening Emergency Needs Assessment Capacity in WFP

SENAC Advisory Group Meeting

14-15 March 2005, Castel Gandolfo

Annotated Agenda

Objective of meeting:

Provide guidance on a research programme which will lead to tools to help strengthen WFP's (and the broader humanitarian community's) capacity to better assess emergency food needs.

Outputs of meeting:

- 1) Recommendations for issues, research strategies, outputs and partnerships for the five SENAC thematic areas; and
- 2) Final TORs for the Advisory Group and agreed next steps for 2005

Background documents:

- Paper outlining framework for Advisory Group discussion on the 5 thematic areas
- three examples of the current standard of WFP emergency needs assessments (Columbia, Sri Lanka and Darfur)
- one example of a WFP pre-crisis baseline report (Burundi) and December 2004 Johannesburg workshop report on the status of FSMS in WFP
- 2004 Executive Board policy document "Strengthening Emergency Needs Assessments: Progress and Implementation Plan"

Participants: Advisory Group members (16), SENAC-funded WFP team (12, including 9 newly appointed regional assessment officers), SENAC Technical Committee members (3), and selected WFP staff from HQ (5-10)

Preparations:

Day 0- Sunday 13 March

16:00 Workshop planning meeting (James Darcy - Chair, Ron Ockwell - Facilitator, David Kaatrud, Darlene Tymo, Wolfgang Herbinger, Jan Delbaere, Agnes Dhur, Svenja Jungjohann)

19:00 Follow-up planning meeting with thematic group leaders (Dorosh, Hoddinott, Devereux, Sahn, Mock), Chair (Darcy), Facilitator (Ockwell), WFP (Kaatrud, Wolfgang, Tymo, Delbaere, Dhur, Jungjohann)

Agenda

Day 1 – Monday 14 March

8:30 *Coffee/pastries*

Setting the Stage on Emergency Needs Assessments in WFP

9:00-9:30 **Opening of meeting**

- David Kaatrud, Director, Analysis, Assessment and Preparedness Service (ODA)
- Alessandro De Matteis, ECHO Nairobi
- James Darcy, SENAC Advisory Group Chair

Introductions, review agenda, housekeeping issues.....
--

9:30-10:30 **Evolution of emergency needs assessments in WFP**

- Wolfgang Herbinger, Chief, Emergency Needs Assessment Branch (ODAN) and Ron Ockwell (author of WFP Emergency Food Security Guidelines (draft 2005)
- Hisham Kogali (IFRC)

1) Provide overview on 2002 and 2004 technical meetings on ENA, WFP's 30 month implementation plan, and SENAC project. Highlight what has (or hasn't) changed over this two year period. Provide broad overview of WFP's assessment approach.

2) Provide overview of ENA initiatives in other organizations, SMART initiative (HK/NM)

10:30-10:45 ***Break***

10:45-12:30 **Examples of WFP emergency needs assessments**

WFP Assessment team members to <i>briefly</i> present 3 ENAs, highlighting a few key SENAC-related issues that the team encountered (note that AG members will have read these reports in preparation for the meeting):

10:45 - 11:00 Sri Lanka Tsunami – Anette Haller/Sonali Wickrema

11:00 - 11:15 Colombia – Nicole Steyer (input from Samir Wanmali)

11:15 – 11:30 Darfur – Wolfgang Herlinger/Annalisa Conte

Includes time for questions and clarifications on the ENAs

12:30-14:30 ***Lunch***

(12:30-13:00) Review and finalize Advisory Group TORs (thematic groups – AG only)

AG to break into thematic sub-groups to review draft TORs

(*Chris Barrett to be hooked up to Markets group discussion by conference call)

Improving WFP's ENA Capacity – What Needs to be Done in 2005

14:30-15:30 **Presentation of key ENA issues (plenary)**

- Jan Delbaere, SENAC Crisis Information Specialist
- Agnes Dhur, SENAC Methods Specialist

- introduce some key issues and proposed tools in the five thematic areas as they relate to emergency needs assessments

15:30-17:30 **Thematic Group work (in thematic groups) (*coffee in groups*)**

Review key issues for each thematic area as they relate to the assessment of emergency needs: - confirm/clarify/add important issues and identify key indicators

- collective knowledge (or gaps) on each issue

(*Chris Barrett to be hooked up to Markets group discussion by conference call.)

17:30 – 18:00 **Review and finalize Advisory Group TORs (plenary – AG only)**

(*Chris Barrett to be hooked up to plenary discussion by conference call).

Day 2 - Tuesday

8:30 ***Coffee/pastries***

9:00-10:30 **Reports from Thematic Groups (plenary)**

Each thematic group leader to report back on key elements of previous afternoon discussion; 15 minutes per group. Facilitator to note areas of overlap.

10:30-10:45 *Break*

10:45-13:00 Thematic Group Work (5 groups)

In context of key thematic issues, develop specific recommendations for the proposed SENAC 1) research strategy (and methods) 2) outputs 3) and suggest partnerships.

(*Chris Barrett to be hooked up to Markets group discussion by conference call.)

13:00-14:30 *Lunch*

14:30-16:00 Presentation by Thematic Groups and discussion (plenary)

Each thematic group leader to present recommendations on research strategy, outputs and partnerships (facilitator to identify overlap/make links). SENAC team will use these to finalize the workplan for 2005. 15 minutes per group.

16:00 – 16:15 *Break*

16:15 - 17:30 Pulling it all Together, Next Steps (plenary)

Facilitator to conclude. Based on final AG TORs, review future on-going relationship between project staff and advisors. Propose topics and date for next meeting.

(17:30-18:00 *Wrap-up meeting of AG Chair and Thematic Group leaders*)

Annex III: Framework for Advisory Group Discussions

Introduction

The objective of the SENAC project is to reinforce WFP's capacity to assess humanitarian needs in the food sector during emergencies and the immediate aftermath through accurate and impartial needs assessments. This includes:

- developing improved analytical methods, tools and guidance materials;
- improving the availability and management of pre-crisis information in countries exposed to recurrent and protracted emergencies; and
- strengthening WFP's field capacity by deploying assessment specialists in its regional bureaux.

The first component of the project, "the development of improved analytical methods and tools resulting from in-depth technical desk and case studies, and field testing" will focus on four themes:

Role of markets in emergencies: studies on cross-border trade, national import capacity and open-market based responses;

Potential effects and impacts of food aid - direct and indirect, positive and negative – on both targeted and non-targeted households in the intervention areas;

Identification of chronic versus transitory food insecurity: studies on mitigating shocks, minimum consumption requirements, interactions between household types and their coping capacities, and assessment of alternative response options;

Non-food responses to food crises and multi-sectoral needs assessment: studies on cash and other possible responses to emergencies, and field testing of multi-sectoral assessment approaches."

The above four themes are inter-linked: the behaviour of markets will influence households' coping strategies; the expected effects of food aid will differ according to chronically versus transitory food insecure households; the relevance of non-food responses will depend on market performance etc. These inter-relations mean that work in these areas should not be undertaken in isolation. Findings and proposals from each study will be regularly shared and their relevance examined in the light of work on the other areas, with the view to adjusting the conclusions and tools developed accordingly.

Moreover, the above four themes are closely related to another theme, and a main component of the SENAC project, which is concerned with Comprehensive Food Security Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) and with food security monitoring systems (FSMS):

Pre-crisis information: improve availability and management of pre-crisis information for priority countries exposed to recurrent and protracted food security emergencies."

Finally, policies already developed by WFP in relevant areas (such as transition from relief to recovery, humanitarian principles, nutrition in emergencies, food-based safety nets, HIV/AIDS and urban areas, etc.) should be taken into consideration.

Research Scope

The focus of the research programme will be on the key issues identified in previous WFP meetings and evaluation reports on emergency needs assessments, in particular the thematic evaluation of “Recurring Challenges in the Provision of Food Assistance in Complex Emergencies” (September 1999), and the Emergency Needs Assessment workshops organized by WFP in November 2002, March 2003, October 2003 and July 2004. Similar issues have been raised in other contexts, such as with the United Nations Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP).

The various studies will not be broad-based academic reviews covering all possible aspects of each theme but will concentrate on a given set of concrete issues relevant to the operations of the WFP and its partners. They will seek to respond to the *“what” and “how”* priority questions (what to look at; how to collect data, analyze and interpret it). Flexibility would be left to expand the research scope based on preliminary findings or new developments in the field, whenever necessary.

Research framework and methodological approach

Causal analysis of food insecurity

The various research themes will combine a causal analysis of food insecurity and livelihoods - including human, financial, economic, institutional, physical, natural and policy components and processes at household, community, national and international levels. The approach will build on models already developed by WFP for emergency food security assessments and Vulnerability, Analysis and Mapping (VAM) systems. It will also aim to elucidate the complex reasons behind food insecurity as well as the rationale for, and limits of coping mechanisms adopted by households (capacities and vulnerabilities).

Methodological approach

The four research themes and the pre-crisis information component require methods and tools to:

- i. analyse the multiple causes and degree of food insecurity at household level (including differentiating between chronic/transitory vulnerability to food insecurity) and the linkages with community, sub-national, national, regional and international levels;
- ii. understand the responses of households to crises - including the impact of these strategies on their current and future livelihoods – as well as households' own priorities, in the broad context of their community, region and country situation;
- iii. anticipate the impact of various assistance options on markets as well as on the population (beneficiaries and non beneficiaries; groups affected by chronic, transitory and vulnerable to food insecurity) in order to select the best options (food and/or non food), targeting criteria and implementation modalities (content, duration, partnership) to improve food and livelihoods security.

For each specific research theme, some critical aspects of each of the above points will be selected for desk and case studies. Desk studies will result in proposals for operational and analytical tools. The review exercise will involve gathering existing information (secondary data) as well as incorporating real-time information collected through the SENAC Food Security and Market Assessment Officers located in the six WFP Regional Bureaux. Field case studies will aim at validating the proposals made by the desk studies by cross-checking the feasibility of applying the proposed tools, and appropriateness of the analytical guidance. The studies should, where possible, build on ongoing country initiatives.

Overall objectives of research (as per the *ECHO* project document)

THEME: “Role of Markets in Emergencies and the Effects of Food Aid on Markets”

To develop improved analytical methods and tools resulting from in-depth technical desk and case studies and field testing, on the role of markets in emergencies and the effects of food aid on markets, through studies on cross-border trade, national import capacity and open-market based responses.

THEME: “Impact of Food Aid on Targeted and Non-Targeted Households”

To develop improved analytical methods and tools resulting from in-depth technical desk and case studies and field testing, in the area of the potential effects and impacts of food aid – direct and indirect, positive and negative – on both targeted and non-targeted households in the intervention areas.

THEME: “Chronic versus Transitory Food Insecurity”

To develop improved analytical methods and tools resulting from in-depth technical desk and case studies and field testing, in the area of chronic and transitory food insecurity, through studies on mitigating shocks, minimum consumption requirements, interactions between household types and their coping capacities, and assessment of alternative response options on cash and other possible responses to emergencies, and field testing of multi-sectoral assessment approaches.

THEME: “Non-Food Responses to Food Crises and Multi-Sectoral Needs Assessments”

To develop improved analytical methods and tools resulting from in-depth technical desk and case studies and field testing, in the area of non-food responses to food crises and multi-sectoral needs assessments, through studies on cash and other possible responses to emergencies, and field testing of multi-sectoral assessment approaches.

THEME: “Improved Availability and Management of Pre-Crisis Information”

To improve the availability and management of pre-crisis information for priority countries exposed to recurrent and protracted food security emergencies, including

overall transparency of data collection, analysis and reporting. The specific objectives are to:

- Improve the depth, scope and availability of country reports and datasets (numerical and spatial) for detailed secondary data analysis;
- Identify and create in-country partnerships (i.e., data collection, analysis, reporting) with other humanitarian actors and relevant government line ministries so as to build synergies and avoid duplication in assessment and analysis activities; and
- Integrate information management systems facilitating the collection, storage, and dissemination of pre-crisis information produced by WFP and its partners in a timely manner.

Framework for Discussion By SENAC Advisory Group

Key Issues and indicators in each thematic area to be considered during the ENA process

(to be confirmed during Advisory Group meeting)

Research strategy to inform the development of tools and analytical methods to address these issues

(to be confirmed during Advisory Group meeting)

SENAC outputs: possible tools and analytical methods

(to be proposed during Advisory Group meeting)

Annex IV: Meeting Participants

Stephen Devereux	Chronic versus Transitory Group	IDS
Hisham Khogali	Chronic versus Transitory Group	IFRC
Phumzile Mdlada	Chronic versus Transitory Group	FEWSNET
Takashi Yamano	Chronic versus Transitory Group	FASID/GRIPS
John Hoddinott	Impact of Food Aid Group	IFPRI
Max Merbis	Impact of Food Aid Group	Center for World Food Studies, Amsterdam
Richard Mawer	Impact of Food Aid Group	SCF/UK
Paul Dorosh	Market Analysis Group	World Bank
Kisan Gunjal	Market Analysis Group	FAO
James Darcy (Chair)	Non-food Responses Group	ODI
Chris Leather	Non-Food Responses Group	OXFAM, UK
Paul Hulshoff	Non-Food Responses Group	UNICEF
Nancy Mock	Pre-Crisis Information Group	Tulane University
Maxx Dilley	Pre-Crisis Information Group	Columbia University
Gary Eilerts	Pre-Crisis Information Group	FEWSNET
Thierry Negre	Pre-Crisis Information Group	JRC
Ron Ockwell	Meeting Facilitator	Consultant
Alessandro de Matteis	Impact of Food Aid	ECHO, Nairobi
Will Whelan	Market Analysis Group	USAID
Thomas Schaeff	Impact of Food Aid Group	GTZ
Endalkachew Alamnew	Emergency Assessment Officer (Food Security)	WFP Regional Bureau (Cairo)
Geert Beekhuis	Emergency Assessment Officer (Market Analysis)	WFP Regional Bureau (Dakar)
Mamadou Diouf	Emergency Assessment Officer (Food Security)	WFP Regional Bureau (Dakar)
Nyakua Simon Dradri	Emergency Assessment Officer (Market Analysis)	WFP Regional Bureau (Johannesburg)
Yvonne Forsen	Emergency Assessment Officer (Food Security)	WFP Regional Bureau (Bangkok)
Naouar Labidi	Emergency Assessment Officer (Food Security)	WFP Regional Bureau (Kampala)
Margarita Lovon	Emergency Assessment Officer (Food Security)	WFP Regional Bureau (Panama)
Sylvie Montembault	Emergency Assessment Officer (Food Security)	WFP Regional Bureau (Johannesburg)
Dekha Skeikh	Emergency Assessment Officer (Market Analysis)	WFP Regional Bureau (Kampala)
Jan Delbaere	Pre-Crisis Information Group	SENAC, WFP
Agnès Dhur	Chronic versus Transitory Group	SENAC, WFP
Darlene Tymo	Impact of Food Aid Group	SENAC, WFP
Jeffrey Marzilli	Impact of Food Aid Group	Evaluation, WFP
Wolfgang Herbinger		ODAN, WFP
Iain McDonald	Pre-Crisis Information Group	ODAP, WFP
Anne Callanan	Pre-Crisis Information Group	OEDP, WFP
Baker Mukeere	Market Analysis Group	Policy, WFP
Nicole Menage	Market Analysis Group	Procurement, WFP
Annalisa Conte	Non-Food Responses Group	VAM, WFP
Eric Kennefick	Chronic versus Transitory Group	VAM, WFP