



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



MICROLINKS SEMINAR SERIES

Exploring Frontiers in Inclusive Market Development

BE PREPARED! EXPERIENCES IN PRE-CRISIS MARKET MAPPING

AUDIO TRANSCRIPT

JUNE 25, 2015

CONTENTS

Presenters.....	3
Presentation	4
Questions and Answers.....	24

PRESENTERS

Emily Sloane, International Rescue Committee

Emily Farr, Oxfam America

Dina Brick, Catholic Relief Services

PRESENTATION

Usman Iqtidar:

Okay. Good morning everyone. Welcome to the Microlinks seminar – *Be Prepared: Experiences in Pre-Crisis Market Mapping*. We are about to start. So welcome to everyone. We look forward to learning more about the topic from our presenters. A few reminders before I hand it over to Laura. Please turn off your cell phones or keep them silent. We'll have time for questions and answers after the presenters are done with their presentations.

So make sure you hold onto the thoughts or comments or questions that you want to ask in the end. And another thing. I'll also remind you afterwards, when we are about to start the Q&A session, try to speak in the mic so our webinar audience can also listen to us. We are also joined by a lot of people on our webinar. I think it's more than 35 right now. And it's from different countries. Nigeria, Philippines, Netherlands, Mali, Luxembourg, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Senegal, so that's like a lot of committed market system mappers around the world.

With that, I'd like to introduce Laura Meissner, who is the economic recovery technical advisor at OFDA, and she will introduce the presenters and the topic.

Laura Meissner:

Thank you so much, Usman. And thank you all for coming. We're really excited about this Microlinks breakfast seminar. We feel it's kind of a special event, because it helps to link sort of the more typical market development audience of Microlinks with what USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance does, which is of course disaster relief. We've supported EMMA, the Emergency Market Mapping Analysis toolkit, since its inception, and we're very excited to also be supporting EMMA's early bird cousin sister, PCMMA, for the Pre-Crisis Market Mapping Analysis guidance.

And it's especially I think of interest to both of our practitioner communities, because PCMMA can help with planning disaster response, as well as with preparedness, disaster risk reduction, capacity building, and sharing market sensitive programming, maybe even laying the foundation for building resilience. In just a moment, I'm going to turn it over to Emily Sloane, who is going to introduce the tool itself. We will then hear a variety of lessons learned from different contexts around the world. So, after that, Dina Brick, from CRS, is going to speak about Sudan. We'll come back to Emily Sloane for Pakistan, and then Emily Farr from Oxfam will talk about learnings from Ethiopia.

Just to briefly introduce the speakers – Emily Sloane, who you'll hear from first, is with the International Rescue Committee. She recently joined them as an emergency markets officer. Previously, Emily was with Oxfam and ACF. She's led an EMMA training in South Sudan. She's just back from Pakistan, actually leading a pre-crisis market mapping, which is what she'll be sharing her experiences from. She's also worked on a range of agriculture and cash and voucher programs. Her own background is in environment, with natural resources, conservation, as well as environmental policy, which led her into the food security and livelihoods world.

When we hear from Dina, she is with CRS at the head of their food security and markets team. She works on proposal development, technical assistance during program implementation, everything relating to market based programming, cash and vouchers, and food security. And her background is in international agriculture, as well as food security and environmental work.

And Emily Farr is with Oxfam America. She is their senior advisor for emergency food security, and vulnerable livelihoods. She has a wealth of experience around the globe – from Asia, Africa, Latin America. She's worked with a lot of the other Oxfam organizations. She focuses on market based programming, resilience, gender, information technology, and previously, before joining the humanitarian world, worked here domestically on decent housing and food security.

So, without any further ado, I will turn it over to Emily Sloane.

Emily Sloane:

Laura mentioned I'm going to give a little bit of an overview of what we're talking about when we talk about pre-crisis market mapping and analysis. So that we're all sort of on the same page. So, being a Microlinks audience, we probably don't have to tell you why markets are important. But from the humanitarian perspective, markets are a very important source of goods and services for all people, including vulnerable populations. And they're also an important source of income for many people. So, as humanitarians, we're particularly interested in what happens to markets during emergencies.

And we need to think about that as we design our responses. So we've seen this with the rise of cash transfer programs, which are really one type of market based response. So if we ignore markets in our response, and we're bringing in goods or services from outside and delivering them in times of crisis, we can actually undermine the recovery of markets. But if we do the opposite and we work through markets and help support markets to recover, then we can actually speed recovery and have benefits

for not only the individuals who are struggling to survive in the wake of a crisis, but also for the markets themselves.

So just a show of hands. Is anyone in this room familiar with EMMA – the Emergency Market Mapping Analysis toolkit? So not too many. So I'm just going to give a little bit of an overview of what EMMA is, because that was sort of the starting point for the pre-crisis market mapping and analysis. So, as humanitarians, in I guess 2009-2010, this started becoming more mainstream. That we would go in after a crisis and actually conduct a market assessment. So that – EMMA – is one of those types of post-crisis market assessments.

So essentially we're looking at the capacity of the market to support the desired response. So, for example, can we deliver needed staple food items through local markets, rather than bringing it in from outside? So that's one very basic example. But it doesn't have to be just related to food. We could do it for any kind of sector – shelter materials, hygiene materials, etc. So the EMMA toolkit sort of took off in 2010, and it's become quite widespread. So that's sort of a standard – not EMMA necessarily. There are other variations of it, including RAM and MAG, developed by IFRC, but the idea is we should go in after a crisis and do a market assessment – otherwise we risk doing harm.

But what we found is that a lot of people were starting to use the EMMA in a context that it wasn't really designed for. So it was designed for rapid onset crises, such as the Nepal earthquake that just happened. But we found that people wanted to use it for other things. So they wanted to use it, for example, in slow onset crisis like drought. They also wanted to use it before crises happened, just to sort of do a baseline market assessment.

So, in response to that, the IRC and Oxfam co-developed this tool called PCMMA. And that came out in draft form last year. So it has a very similar structure and approach to EMMA, but there are some important differences. Just to give you a little bit of a background on EMMA, there's a whole toolkit. You can read all about it online. But it's essentially a pretty structured methodology with three main components.

So gap analysis is looking at what people's needs are and preferences, at the sort of beneficiary, if you will, level. Then you look at the markets. So, as I mentioned, with markets, we're looking at what is the capacity of those markets to support the needs of those affected people in the quantity needed. And then, finally, we look at response analysis. So what are possible ways that we could respond to these crises? What would be advantages and disadvantages of each? And, based on these three strands, we can create some recommendations on what might be the response options with the best outcome for markets and local people.

So, as I mentioned, there's a sort of whole step by step methodology to EMMA. These are the official ten steps. But it sort of works you through. But I won't go into it too much now. And then there are specific tools that EMMA uses. So you've probably seen variations of this. I think in the event description for this they talked about how we're looking at the value chain or market chain for different market systems. But actually a market system map is a little bit more than that.

So when we're talking about market systems, we're not talking about the marketplace where you go to buy and sell goods. We're actually talking about the network of all things that impact one particular good or service. So for examples we could do – this is the market map we put together in Pakistan for flooding. And here we're looking at wheat flour. So a very, very specific item. So in the middle you see the market chain. That's what we're familiar with, from production to end consumption, all the different steps and actors that that product passes through.

But at the top we also have the market environment. So what rules, what policies, what trends, what climatic factors affect this particular market system? And then, on the bottom, we have infrastructure and inputs. So what are the most important pieces of infrastructure, inputs, or services that are needed for this market system to function? So whether those are roads, or storage facilities, or financial credit services for vendors, whatever those things are, those go in our map as well. So it's trying to present a sort of comprehensive picture of what can be sometimes fairly complex.

Okay. So that is sort of the nutshell of what we talk about when we talk about EMMA. So, as I mentioned, PCMMA is very similar to EMMA. But so there's a couple main differences. One is the timing. So with EMMA, we start by looking at the past. So I'll refer to Nepal because it's fresh in our minds. So first we look at what were the markets like in Nepal before the quake? And normally we look one month before the quake. And then we look at the present. So now what are those market systems like? What has the impact of that disaster been on those market systems?

Then we are able to look at the future. So based on the information that we have, what do we foresee for these market systems for the next 6 to 12 months? So it's pre-crisis market mapping. It's a little bit different, because we reverse the two. So we should be conducting these assessments in quote unquote normal times. So we're starting with the present. So what do market systems look like now? And then using some kind of reference crisis, we look at what happened to markets the last time there was this type of disaster.

So in Pakistan we looked at flooding. So what happened to the wheat flour market during the 2010 floods? So we look back and look at what the impact was. And based on that, and based on what we know the market system looks like now, we can say, "Okay, what is likely to happen in the event of a disaster, a similar disaster, in the future?" So these are relevant in places where you have fairly predictable crises. So places with recurring conflicts, like Eastern Congo, places like Pakistan with frequent floods, places like the Sahel with almost annual drought. This is where pre-crisis market mapping analysis makes sense to us.

The other big difference, besides the timing, is the potential application. So with these post-crisis assessments, obviously your main focus is on emergency response. So in the quake, we're talking about how can we deliver shelter materials to people through using market systems? But it's quite urgent, it's quite pressing, it's about delivery of needed humanitarian goods and services. With pre-crisis market mapping analysis, we can do the same thing. So we are also looking at future emergency responses. But because we're doing it before, we have a little more leeway to look at some other and kind of exciting options as well.

So we can look at preparedness. So what can we do to get ready for an emergency response that will utilize markets? We can also do disaster risk reduction – are the things we can do now to strengthen markets, or make them less vulnerable, so that when crises do happen, the impact is less. We can also in certain cases help to develop early warning indicators. So if we know what normally happens to markets as slow onset crises like drought are unfolding, then maybe we can better predict them in the future, then be more prepared to respond.

And then finally, because you're doing this assessment in a non-crisis time, there's a little more freedom to do capacity building. So market analysis capacity in the humanitarian field is something that's been a struggle to build. We've been working on it. So it's nice. And in an emergency, with an EMMA, you're really focused on getting that response designed as quickly as possible. So it's not really the right time to be reflecting and discussing how markets function, and these finer concepts of market analysis. But in a pre-crisis context, you have a little more space and time to do so.

And then in case you're interested, I don't know if these – this presentation will be shared. But there are a lot of resources online where you can read more about PCMMA, EMMA, and sort of join the conversations that are happening. So there's EMMA website that has a lot of documents on it, including EMMA toolkit and the pre-crisis market mapping analysis guidance document. There's also community of practice, where there's

some interesting discussions, and we are very much in need of more development oriented members in that group. And we also have the Twitter account that is rapidly growing *[laughter]*.

So without any further ado, so I'll hand it over to Dina, who is going to start talking about actual learning from PCMMAs we've tried out.

Dina Brick:

Thanks, Emily. So just a little bit of background. The reason why we ordered the presentations as we did – there is actually a method to the madness. So I'm just back from Sudan, where we were leading a training in PCMMA. And we've gotten to about half of the steps in the PCMMA manual. So we're at about from step one to eight, if you're to look at the PCMMA manual. Then I'll pass it back to Emily Sloane, who just spoke. They're a little bit further along in their PCMMA in Pakistan. Then Emily Farr will talk about Ethiopia, because they've gone all the way. So we're kind of bringing slightly different perspectives, based on where we are in the process.

So just a little bit of context. I won't go into too much detail. I was in Khartoum. So we did this training in Khartoum. But it's for a project that's based out of Darfur. Which is really a resilience focused program. And it's in year three of the program. But a little bit of background. Many of you are familiar with this context. But what's relevant to the PCMMA process – as you know, this is a situation of ongoing crises. So it's quite unique in the sense of identifying pre-crisis in the midst of a crisis. And I'll talk a little bit about that, about the discussions that we had around that.

The political constraints are many. To the point where for any assessment, related or not related to market assessment, getting even to the field to be doing an assessment is a real challenge. So, in our training, we ended up training with each other. We actually weren't even able to go to a market, because the government wouldn't let us go. So that's just a challenge, sort of a lesson for any assessment, I would say. But just to note that there are these contexts that are quite complex in that sense.

In terms of management and staffing for this particular program, because of the political constraints, because of security constraints, a lot of this is going to be remote. So we've gone through the training process, and now they're in the process of planning their assessment, which will be starting in the next couple of weeks, pending many things, right? It's pending government approval, it's pending security. So there are quite a few constraints going forward with this.

Just a bit of background. The consortium itself is five NGOs, six NGOs including Tadood, although they're not taking part in the assessment. And

it will be throughout all five states in Darfur. This will be an assessment that we're leading together as a consortium. And the problem that the program itself is looking at is that households in returning areas have insecure livelihoods. So it's a livelihoods-focused, resilience-focused program. And, coming from a humanitarian background, and having EMMA, and that emergency market assessment knowledge, that was a really interesting and I would say I don't know it's a lot of good opportunities for learning when we're working with this kind of a tool within a resilience project.

The crisis that we will be looking at for this PCMMA is drought. There's a possibility that we will be looking also at armed conflict, but I'll talk about how there's challenges within that as well. So, again, this is just about the Tadood project in general. Just to give you some context. It's a resilience focused program, as I noted. The focus is on building on existing systems. So the aims of our PCMMA are not really going to be emergency focused. They're going to be more of what Emily noted before about the preparedness, the DRR. What can we do to strengthen the market, the links in the market chain that will probably break during the next drought? What can we do now to prevent that?

So we're really looking at using this as a way of mitigating the impacts of a potential crisis. The focus is on producers and livelihoods, and we found this to be a challenge. Because market assessments are really not livelihoods assessments, right? So the objective itself really has to be clear in a program like this. As I noted, there are a few asset transfers built into this program. And Emily gave a background of the EMMA, and how often that's about how best do we utilize these markets to transfer food, or to transfer shelter materials, or something like that, to an affected population? And that's not really the goal of this program.

So what was really exciting about this, and about this opportunity, is how can we use this tool to be doing something different than what we're used to in a humanitarian context? So I've pulled out six learnings that I just want to walk through. And would also love you feedback at the end from your own experiences in similar contexts. And this is sort of learning from the early stages. The first half of the pre-crisis EMMA toolkit.

The first one, pre-planning, is critical. And I don't think this is necessarily any different from assessments in general, right? This is just something that is really an important part. I bring it up because it is spelled out pretty clearly in the PCMMA guidance about how to be getting prepared, and some of the steps that you need to be doing to be getting prepared. Selection of participants is really important. This is one thing that we noted early. To be doing – whether you do a PCMMA training that's connected to the actual assessment itself, which is what the Emilys did, or

because of our constraints we couldn't actually do that in the field, so we had to do a training, and then they're going to do the assessment.

But the ability to have a team leader that really has some markets knowledge already is really critical. This doesn't have to be – this isn't a tool for economists, but there does have to be someone on the team that is really familiar with markets. And in particular is familiar with needs assessments. One thing we noted is that not everybody has to be a markets expert to take part in something like this. But you have to have some experience with assessments.

And we did note that we wanted to include some kind of market basics as a component of the training. So we didn't spend very long at all talking about markets. But it was actually useful to have some kind of a refresher about some of the marketing, some of the basics, and what are markets, and why are we doing this at all? You'll see as we read through the guidance that the market focal point is one of the key people in this whole process. So this is the person that makes some of the decisions around the market, is able to guide some of the – to guide the different teams as they go out to the field to collect this data, and also will guide the response analysis process.

This is actually something that Emily noted that is this a mythical person? Can this – does this person exist? How do we find this person? In this case, in Darfur, I am co-market focal point with someone sitting in Darfur. I mean you already see the red flags and the challenges that that could pose. But it's the reality, right? So it is as designed right now it is someone that really has the view of the whole situation. But that is something that we're really interested, I think, as all of us go through this process, to see how best we can utilize that person, and how best to identify that person.

I won't go into detail about logistics. Anyone that's done an assessment knows that it's your best friend and it's your worst enemy, right? But just to note that it's a really critical part of something like this. Because often you only have staff for a certain amount of time, and you really need to make sure that you're getting into the field at the best – when you need to be getting there. I just highlighted a couple of the criteria that we have noted here. You can see them. But just looking at some kind of previous experience in terms of doing leading assessments, having some basic skillsets.

So the second learning is setting an appropriate objective can be harder than it looks. So this was, Emily mentioned, some of the objectives related to pre-crisis market mapping. And some of the challenges associated with that that we saw is because this is more of a resilience and

development program, we are doing the PCMMA in year two to three. And, often, if you're doing an EMMA, for example, you're doing it at the very beginning, because you want to know how you're going to respond. This is a very different model. We're using it in the course of a project, which is interesting and challenging, I think.

Basically, we were going to be informing, through this project, we're using a PCMMA to look at two critical market systems. Right now, we're going to be looking at millet and sorghum. And we're going to see what are some of the things that we can do to strengthen those market chains. So the program participants will be doing pilot programs for the third year of this project to sort of start to build some DRR to look at some possible resilience outcomes that can be implemented over the last year.

The goal of the program is not emergency focused, as I noted. So the resilience programming is sort of a new territory, especially for humanitarian actors, despite all the past few years' discussions about resilience and where it sits. That's still something that I think we haven't all worked out, right? And the target group for a production focused program is really the farmer, right? So the project that we're working on now is really supporting farmers. Whereas the EMMA map that Emily showed earlier, you could see that the target group, the people that we're looking to serve through this kind of market chain, is often the consumer.

I'll just show you real quick. This is our draft map. You don't have to really see all the details. You just have to see the colors. So the pink is what we decided would be our target groups for this project. And if you remember, in Emily's map, the target groups were really the consumers on the right. They were like the people that, in the case of a crisis, we want to make sure that they have access to the markets, they have continued access to the markets in a crisis. And our project in Tadood, we also want to look at what we can do to support the producer. And we actually might be looking at what we can do to support the other different market actors along the chain.

So the target group kind of changes, we noted, over the course of the past couple of weeks. It's not only going to be – we're not only looking to support the communities, but also all those different other actors in the chain, including possibly the producers. And the last note that I wanted to mention here – this is just maybe this is just a management thing. But I think with a tool like this where we're looking at a crisis in the midst of a resilience program, the staff themselves are development people. So that was really kind of a head shift also for a lot of the staff, to start to think about we're looking at what's going to happen in a crisis.

I mean they're familiar with crisis. They've been living with it for 15 years. But the program itself was really more development focused. And that's really been an interesting learning for them also as we were going forward to kind of look at the relationship between the emergency and development continuum, if you will. This could be actually an interesting tool to look at that. So I won't go through these objectives, but just to show briefly, to reflect what Emily just noted, the first one and the last one are really about capacity and preparedness of the agency.

So the objectives of this project, in the end, were we wanted to build our own capacity and the capacity of the consortium members. And the last one is we want to be prepared for the next emergency that will happen. And the two in the middle are the ones that I just sort of noted. We want to be looking at how we can build the resilience of the communities, and also how we can be – the third one is how we can be strengthening the market system itself, how we can be strengthening the market chain before the next crisis.

So learning three – you can define a crisis amid a crisis, maybe *[laughter]*. So this is something that I think will be an ongoing learning. We had identified two crisis that we want to be looking at. Drought. The last significant drought was in 2010. And armed conflict is the other one. The thing about drought which was an interesting learning is that the drought was in 2010, however you need to – we need to choose a specific time to be collecting data for, a specific period of time, so we can ask vendors, "Tell us about this period." They need to have some kind of a recall period.

So when we were thinking about the drought, it actually wasn't 2010, it was the period before the next drought in 2011. So it was the period when the impact of the drought was the most significant. For armed conflict – this, in the end, I'm not sure we're going to be able to do this, actually. This was something that they said this is a really important part of Darfur and the Darfur experience. However, this year is actually kind of a flare up year. This, people were saying, this year is a conflict year. And this brings me to that last point there.

If we're looking at drought, and we're going to be collecting information about the drought, but this is also a crisis year for armed conflict, we're going to have to be really careful in the way we ask questions, and in the way we analyze the data, to make sure that there aren't too many variables, right? This isn't actually a normal year. This is a crisis year, but there's often crises. So we have to be really careful in the way that we analyze that data. And another complicating factor in Darfur is that in speaking to the people there, there are multiple types of crises, right?

There are the farmer herder crises, which happen regularly, and that's something that can be anticipated. There is regular tribal conflict, which is actually quite irregular, and it doesn't depend on the seasons, and it just happens whenever, but those are regular things that happen. And then there's armed conflict, which is the one that they were really concerned about. So, just to note that the definition of the crisis – this, I think, is going to be a really interesting learning as we go forward.

The fourth one – this, I think was a really interesting one. The quantitative isn't always the most useful information. So often in market assessments, and particularly in EMMA's, actually, you need to know – what is the volume of a product? What is the price of a product at a given time? How did that change? What are the volumes? What are the numbers of vendors? Those are very quantitative information. And that's actually really critical for a market assessment.

When you're doing a four year recall – so we're going to be asking vendors, "Four years ago, in June 2011, what had happened in the impact, due to the impact of this drought?" We can't ask people, "How much were you selling per week, and then how much were you selling per week, a month after that?" Because this was four years ago and people are not going to remember that. So what will be more useful for us is percent change.

So we're going to be looking at, "Tell us what happened in general." They will be able to say, "My something decreased by about a third," or, "It decreased by about a half," or, "There was suddenly new vendors that came in." We'll be able to get some trends, but we won't really be able to get quantitative stuff. But actually I think for what our purposes are, I think that's fine, and I think that's really useful information.

The fifth one is choosing the market system was actually quite challenging as well. And this is specifically related to the fact that we're looking at a pre-crisis versus a crisis. So in Darfur, we decided to choose millet and sorghum, which are both key food security commodities, key food security products, but initially we were saying, "Oh, we'll just look at millet, because that's the preferred commodity in a crisis." What we – that's the preferred commodity in Darfur. People prefer millet.

Then, after a little bit of discussion, we said, "Actually, though, during a crisis, people often shift to sorghum." And that's been an interesting thing that's been happening over the past 15 years now. People actually because of our food aid, because of blocks in the supply chain, people eat sorghum during a crisis. So it wouldn't make sense to only be looking at millet, because in the next crisis, there won't be any millet, so we have to make sure that you're looking at the crisis commodity as well as the substitute

normal commodity. So that was an interesting learning from that one as well. And, to do that, you just have to do your homework and find that out. And there's other experiences about that choice, also.

And the final one is that this is very preliminary, right? We're just in the middle phases of this first PCMMA. But the potential applications, I think, could be really, really interesting, and really, really different from what we've been able to see before. I just wanted to show briefly sort of the continuum. You've probably seen this in other forms. The types of market based programs. On the left is asset transfers using a market – so cash and vouchers. In the middle is market support – so supporting a vendor, supporting transport, supporting the market directly so that the market can continue to provide for beneficiaries or provide for people.

And then the one on the right is market strengthening. So how can we be strengthening the market so it can be, itself, can be more prepared for the next crisis? Normally what we would do in an EMMA is look at really the first two – the ones on the left – because we're looking at how can we transfer an asset? Or, possibly, how can we benefit the market, how can we be providing some direct support to the market? What we're going to be looking at through the pre-crisis EMMA is actually the one on the right.

So it'll be some kind of market strengthening now, looking at – in the next drought, what's going to break in that millet supply chain, most likely, and what can we do now in order to prevent that? So the kinds of activities that we were looking at, I listed a couple here that it would be some kind of support to the market actors. We did some preliminary guessing. We haven't collected all the field data yet. But we had a lot of knowledge in the room. So we started to pull out some of that potential guesswork.

This was the first attempt at our post-crisis map. And without looking at any of the details, you can see where some of the blocks are, right? It's from the producer to the first intermediary. There's some new intermediaries, right? There's food aid. But we were looking at some of those first potential blocks and saying, "Okay, maybe we can build up the capacity of those first small traders." Maybe it's a storage issue. There was a credit issue that was brought up. So there's the potential for some really interesting stuff in terms of providing cash for some of the traders. Supporting their credit lines. Something that is quite different than what we would have done in the traditional EMMA.

So the potential applications of this kind of work, I think, could be really interesting. I'm going to pass it back to Emily for her experiences in Pakistan.

Emily Sloane:

Okay, thanks. So I already talked. So I'm going to keep this fairly brief. But just to give you a quick context. So at IRC, we are currently in the middle of an OFDA funded grant focused on developing and promoting market assessment tools for humanitarian actors. So as part of this we are revising that PCMMA guidance doc that I mentioned earlier, based on learning from other organizations' initial experiences with pre-crisis assessments, and also with our own. So as part of that we're doing three pilots of the methodology. And we just finished our first one in Pakistan at earlier this month. And I'll be leaving tomorrow for Niger where we're doing our second.

So I'm going to share a little bit of the learning that we got from Pakistan. So just very quickly. There's frequent flooding in Pakistan. It's particularly bad in Sindh province, which is in the south. So we were looking at Sindh and at floods. We were looking both at emergency response and this sort of market strengthening longer term development stuff that we've been talking about. And of course we wanted to gather learning on the overall approach, so that we can put that into a revision of the document.

So two and a half weeks from late May through early June, we had nine different agencies participating, including some Pakistani NGOs, and then a lot of larger internationals. We looked at a mix of staple food items, livestock fodder, and drinking water, just so we can cover these ranges of sectors. So some conclusions. The first one for me was, having only experience with EMMA, I was relieved to discover that if you can lead an EMMA, you can lead a PCMMA. It's really not that different.

Those ten steps that I showed you, and the three strands of analysis, are essentially the same. However, there was one exception. So that is about timing. So Dina has already talked about this, so I'm not going to elaborate too much, but the idea is, with an EMMA, it's pretty straightforward. You go to Nepal. It's one month after the quake. You analyze what markets looked like the month before the quake. You analyze what markets look like now. And you have your pre and your post crisis. And you're done.

With pre-crisis market assessments, it's no so straightforward. So you know what the markets look like now, but for us now with June 2015. Normally floods happen in the August-September time period. So if we gather data about now, it's not very useful, especially if we're looking at agricultural markets like livestock fodder and food. So then we have to ask about – we can't really ask about August 2015, so we have to ask about August 2014. But then we're talking about floods that happened in 2010. So we can't use August 2014 as a baseline for the pre-crisis when the crisis happened in 2010 because obviously prices could have gone up

since then, government policies could have changed. There's all kinds of things that could have happened.

So we really struggled with this. And normally you show two maps in your report – the pre and the post crisis. So we struggled a bit. So our conclusion – as I mentioned, we weren't sure which ones to show. So I think this is the August 2014 one, which is a good basis for what may happen in the future. So the conclusion is that baseline timing is complicated *[laughs]*. And as Dina mentioned, the trends, the idea of trends and impacts may be more useful than actual numbers.

And you really need to be very clear with your team about what points of time you're most interested in, because it's always tricky when you're asking about what happened in the past, and it gets very, very confusing if you're collecting data about ten different points in time. So you need to be very, very clear about that from the start. So that's it so far. No great conclusions about that. But I think we need to address that better in our guidance document.

The third conclusion is simply that the potential applications of doing these assessments are really valuable. So as I mentioned we were looking at both emergency response and sort of market strengthening longer term stuff. So we did the emergency response stuff, and we discovered that unsurprisingly – this usually happens – to a large extent, the markets were able to provide these items in times of flooding, and probably would be in the future. But we also discovered other things.

For example, when floods happen, yes, roads are cut off, but one of the big reasons that prices go up, and that people go further into debt, is that their existing stocks are destroyed. So if you have two months more wheat flour supply in your village, but it's destroyed by the flood because your storage is not water tight, then that means you're going to have to sell you cows to have enough money to support your family for that longer gap. And the people we talked to were still recovering from that five years later. But it wasn't just limited to the village.

Surprisingly, even the government warehouses that are there that are supposed to be stocking these food items for the reasons of food security – they were not water tight either. And so during floods they lost a lot of their stock. And at the district villages' level, they lost a lot of their stock. So I mean it was a very obvious conclusion that there's a lot of stuff you could do to just improve the overall quality of storage. And that would mean that floods in the future have a much less severe impact. I mean that's a very basic conclusion, but it's a very valuable conclusion. So and then there were lots of other things like that.

So in terms of planning, preparedness planning, disaster management planning, what are the best routes to market? Where do people normally gather? What are the high points of land when floods happen? Because we could pre-position storage facilities there. We could pre-position water pumps there. There are all kinds of things that you can do. So overall we think it does make sense to do these assessments. There's a lot of value.

And the fourth conclusion is the counter to that, which is that even though we have these great recommendations, it's not always clear who is going to be in a position to carry them out. So we as humanitarians are not always equipped with the right networks, or the right skillsets, or whatever, to be able to put together an emergency mapping plan, or to pre-position things, or to work on improved storage facilities, because that's not what we normally do. And, also, these pre-crisis times are normally times of very scarce funding for humanitarian actors.

So when we were there, IRC was about to get rid of a large portion of its staff, and a lot of the agencies in that area were in a similar position. So our entire *[laughs]* assessment team was like towards the end of its contract, and it was kind of a sad time. So where are they supposed to get the funding in these non-crisis times to do these great interventions that will prevent the severity or impact of these disasters in the future? So we're in the position *[laughs]* of having these great recommendations that may never see the light of day.

So I had a few thoughts about how we may start to address this, but I'd also be interested in later on maybe hearing from you. So my ideas are better linkages between humanitarian and development actors, not only like among different agencies, but sometimes within different agencies, are not really talking. Another one is really just trying to figure out good methods for knowledge management and dissemination. So we have these reports. Maybe the next flood won't be for four more years. But we have all these great recommendations. So we need to make sure that internally these reports are known about, and that the right managers have them, so when a disaster happens, they're like, "Oh, yeah, we know what to do, this is part of our contingency plan."

And then I think we need, in the humanitarian community, a lot more sort of push promotion evidence building and advocacy around the value of investing in preparedness, and seeking out funding for those kinds of projects. All right. So that is, in a nutshell, my learning from Pakistan. So I'm going to pass it over to Emily Farr.

Emily Farr:

Thank you. Hi, everyone. So I'm going to talk a little bit about some learnings from a PCMA that Oxfam did in Tigray and Afar, Ethiopia, which are in the northern regions of the country. We had three objectives.

These objectives will probably look a little bit familiar to you at this stage in the presentation. So the first one was around capacity building of both staff and partners to be able to use market analysis across preparedness response and ongoing programs. The second was around improving preparedness specifically. And the third – identifying activities that we could do in non-emergency times that would either mitigate or enable people to adapt, etcetera. So, for example, through DRR, a resilience kind of program.

So the first of the two region was Afar. We were based specifically in the district of Abala. And Abala is divided into two livelihood zones. We have both the pastoralist groups as well as the agro-pastoralist groups. So there's some agriculture that happens there as well. But in general it's not really known to be an agricultural region. It's a pretty hot, dry, dusty, rocky kind of context. So we used a lot of existing government data, historical trends around hazards, as well as our own experience from this region, local knowledge, and identified drought as a primary hazard.

The second location was in the Tigray region. So this is Raya Azebo woreda. Raya Azebo district. This is an agro-pastoralist area, little bit better conditions overall for agriculture. And, again, here our analysis showed that drought was the primary hazard. So looking at two different regions, two different locations, there's three different livelihoods groups amongst those different locations. But looking at drought as the primary hazard in both.

We selected four critical market systems across the two regions. So in Abala we are looking at maize. Maize is both a main staple food that's purchased by poor households. It's also produced for household consumption. And small numbers of people are also able to produce it to sell. Sheep and goats, or shoats, we looked at that in both Abala and Raya Azebo. These are really critical income market systems in emergencies.

Sorghum in Raya Azebo – both a staple food as well as produced for income source. And teff. You probably are familiar with teff. Staple grain of Ethiopia that you use to make injera. And in Raya Azebo we looked at that also as a key income source. So we had some benefit of a previous PCMMA that happened in late 2014 in the Somali region of Ethiopia as part of a pilot. And so we were able to get some learning from that and use that in our planning.

So a few things that we took away from the previous experience – more emphasis on the practical preparation, on the logistics. Dina has already mentioned that, but that's really critical. Just making sure we have enough time for the exercise. So we added a few extra days. We had 11 in total. To be reasonable about the scope, this is one that I think we still didn't do

quite as well on, as you've already heard. We were looking at some different locations, different contexts. We actually collected data on a couple additional critical market systems than those that I mentioned on the previous slide. And we ended up not really following all of them through with the analysis and the conclusion.

So we ended up with a lot of data. We probably could have focused a little bit further. And the last one was really to get the critical market systems right. And I'm going to talk a little bit more about that. A few challenges that we experienced – you've already heard some about this – the issues with the period of analysis. In our case, drought is something that can happen over – in a couple of years. Within that period, you have normal seasonal variations, you have normal kind of lean seasons or hunger periods in addition to a drought itself.

So in a normal year, as well as within a drought year, you have a lot of different variation in getting the timing right in terms of when you're collecting the data, the dates that you're collecting the data for. You've heard a lot from my colleagues on this. This was also a challenge for us [*laughs*].

A bit of a challenge around aligning some of the EMMA and the PCMMA guidance. Emily did a good description of the two different processes. There's a lot of similarities between them, as you've heard. The EMMA guidance document is really a full on document. Really describes everything in a lot of detail. There are ten steps. The PCMMA guidance. It's a new document. It's meant to be one that we're going to learn from and adapt and change over time. It doesn't go into lots and lots of detail. So there's a lot that you can pull from the EMMA experience to use in your PCMMA document.

However, the EMMA is a ten step process. The PCMMA 15 step process. And to actually try to align those is – that was still a challenge for us. Another aspect is that in training people, in building capacity around PCMMA, you also hope that that leaves them more prepared to do future EMMAs, right? So as much as those can kind of be aligned and in sync, that's going to help us in the long run.

And the last two kind of go together. We collected a lot of data. There was a lot of data, a lot of analysis. This definitely impacted our – that and the fact there was a little bit less pressure overall to get those reports done – that definitely impacted our ability to come out with a timely report. So at this stage, we did the data collection through mid-February, and we're just doing the final edits of our reports now.

So a few conclusions. One of the objectives was to build capacity, and it does seem that this is a really successful approach. We had Oxfam staff, we had local partners from all around the country as well as the locations where we were actually doing the analysis, and local government staff. Most of them had little market experience before this. We used a really mixed methods, hands-on approach, very practical training. And this learning kind of learning by doing hands-on approach left people in kind of a good position to do future PCMMAs.

And I want to just draw your attention here on the bottom to this line. "I feel confident to lead a future EMMA or PCMMA." After the exercise, 70 percent of people felt confident to do that. And that's a real difference that we've seen from the EMMA trainings, where one of the biggest challenges we had was people would go do an EMMA training, they would understand things, but when somebody said, "Okay, well, can you go ahead and lead one?" They'd say, "Oh, I'm not sure, I haven't done one before." So they didn't actually have the confidence. So this is self-reported data. It has limitations. But I think that confidence is a bit of a difference between the two approaches.

So moving on to the next point, again, the details on this slide are not important, but what I wanted to show here was we did a lot of analysis to identify critical market systems. We did analysis thinking about challenges we had faced in past responses. We used HEA baseline data – the Household Economy Approach – which is what this represents. Looking at a potential drought scenario, trying to analyze the impact of a drought on different market systems, around different sources of food and income and the ways that people are spending their money.

We used more qualitative baseline data. We used local knowledge and local experiences. But even after all of that, there wasn't consistency in the results, and we still had some questions. So what we decided to do is just take the first day of our field work to confirm our critical market systems. And we just did this with some focus group discussions, different locations, men and women, and we just asked them basic questions around people's main sources of food, income, expenditures particularly around food.

And in particular we wanted to understand this for each wealth group. So how are the poor getting their food? How are the poor getting their income? What about the middle, what about the better off? And of course to understand this in both the baseline as well as in the reference period, the drought period. And what we found from this is we got different results than all of our *[laughs]* graphs, charts, and analyses. Not entirely different, but there was some differences.

So, for example, in Abala, in Afar, wheat had been identified particularly by the local actors, the local people who were with us in the workshop, as the key commodity. But when we actually went out to talk to people, we found that for the poor, for the poorest wealth group, actually maize was the most important commodity. So and that's because it's the cheapest. And so that was I mean immediately clear after just one or two discussions. And so this – using this first day we felt was really important.

And so one of the key distinctions between maybe the EMMA and the PCMMA around this is that in an EMMA you're probably going to have really fresh data. You're going to have assessments. People are just going to be coming from the field, probably asking a lot of these basic types of questions. In the PCMMA, I mean we were using these HEA baselines that were seven, eight years old. People who even from the area maybe had made some assumptions. Maybe they didn't know as much about the poor groups compared to other income groups, other wealth groups. So if you don't have fresh data, just testing those assumptions. You don't want to mess that stage up [*laughs*].

So another conclusion. You've heard this conclusion before, but the potential applications are really valuable. So this table is from Abala. And this one is from Raya Azebo. And rather than the details, what I just wanted to illustrate here – you saw from Dina's presentation she had a kind of similar table, but had not yet filled out. So this is just a summary of the recommendations that we came away with.

This is sort of the later stage of this. And so you can see that for different periods, the emergency preparedness and contingency planning, then within the humanitarian response, different types of – different levels of kind of working with or through markets, as well as a longer term market strengthening and developments. Then, for each of the different market systems that we looked at, we came away with this kind of range of recommendations. And this sort of scope and spectrum I think is a bit unique to this tool, at least in kind of a typical humanitarian experience.

Then, finally, this is a point that also links with Emily Sloane's last point. We need to also integrate action planning. You do this analysis, but then what, right? You've got to have some follow on activities. And I'm just going to talk quickly through some of these different things that need to be considered for after the PCMMA.

One is around market monitoring. This is a component of the PCMMA process. And this goes beyond just kind of price monitoring, but really understanding, continuing to understand those critical market systems, identifying indicators, and looking at how those may be changing over time. That can also serve as early warning. And so if you don't have an

early warning system in place, if you don't have a market monitoring system in place that would allow you to collect more than just kind of really basic data, then this is something that needs some sort of mechanism.

A deeper seasonal analysis we've discussed a lot in here. Those challenges. And so you may need to be able to collect some additional data to be able to better understand some of those seasonal variations. Understanding regional linkages. You're not going to be able to get to all of the parts of a country that may have some relationship with your more local market system. So for example if items are being produced in other regions, you may be able to get some price data, but you probably aren't going to be able to go and talk to traders in those other regions and really confirms your maps and those regional linkages. So that's something that may need some additional follow on work.

Expansion into other regions. So in Ethiopia, Oxfam is working in a lot of other parts of the country beyond what we've been able to do where we've been able to do PCMMAs. And so it'd be important to continue that work. Building on learning. Of course, for capacity building purposes, you need to be able to kind of continue to do something in order to retain those skills. So having your staff go and work in some of those other regions to collect information, do PCMMAs.

And then, finally, and this is a little bit more what Emily Sloane was talking about, just of course following up on the recommendations.

[End of Audio]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Usman Iqtidar: Very quick, we'll go to questions and answers now. I'm sure we have some time for that. Very quickly, when you are presenting your question, try to speak into the mic so that we can put – we can make sure that the people on the webinar can hear as well. And quickly just also say your name and the name of your organization, and try to keep it a little short so that we can accommodate as many people as possible. And also we'll be alternating between our webinar audience and in-room audience, so I think we'll start with the in-room first. So if anybody has a comment.

Luke Bostian: That's what I get for being close to the guy. So, thanks, everybody. I thought it was really interesting. I appreciate all the presentations. This is Luke Bostian, from Aga Khan Foundation. My question is about the data. And sort of a specific question for Dina and then for all of you. One of the things Dina mentioned was you had difficulty, or there wasn't any real hard data about market – you couldn't ask people to get – what they were selling stuff for in like June of 2010.

But was nobody tracking that information in 2010? And are we tracking it now so that in 2020, when we need to do another five year retrospective, that data actually is available, and then that kind of leads into the broader question, which is, okay, so you guys have all talked about collecting a lot of data, but how is that being stored, how is it being shared, how is it being made useful not just for IRC or Oxfam or CRS, but for when CRS needs IRC's data, or when some local government needs Oxfam's data, or however you want to use it, how is that kind of how does that work?

Dina Brick: I can, yeah, I'll respond first. That's a great question. And, in Darfur, there is no shortage of information about – I mean we've been doing food aid – the humanitarian community has been providing food aid for years, right? So there actually is quite a bit of secondary data. It's not exactly in that time period. But we will have – we're in the desk review phase now, right? So we will have quite a bit of data not exactly in the time period that we're looking for, but we do have quite a bit of background data. Like WFP has a pretty comprehensive market assessment for both millet and sorghum already.

And actually that was a really interesting learning. No one likes doing desk reviews, right? But we have to. I mean this is sort of a necessary thing. And actually this process was really useful in pointing that out, that we will get so much more information, and we will have to do actually a lot less field work if we can use that data. And it won't be exactly the timeframe, so we're going to have to complement it with some of this like recall data. But we are going to be using hopefully a significant amount of background data for that.

In terms of sharing, that I think is not unique to this process, right? This is the perma-question about like sharing among organizations, and sharing especially I think between development actors and relief actors. For now, what's useful is that we had a number of different – we had some government people that were part of the process, a research group. There were five NGOs that were part of it. And we still have one more year of the program, which is sort of unique I think in that sense. So I'm hoping that that learning can continue to be shared.

In terms of forums, it'll be this is something we'll be sharing on the markets and crisis group. So everyone should join that *[laughter]*. Yeah. I'll stop there, if you guys want to complement that, especially the second part about sharing among organizations, right?

Emily Sloane: Sure. Yeah. I mean we were also able to collect price data. We were able to get data on the numbers and types of different traders. On numbers of farmers. So within that market chain, you can get a fair amount of quantitative data. I mean again some of those just – this may change over a season. So there's still some questions, maybe, in terms of translating those lines into the map. Yeah. And just echo what Dina said. I mean I think we'll do our best, at least get our reports with our analyses out there. I think raw data maybe is a different question. I don't have a good answer for that *[laughs]*.

Luke Bostian: ...have to put it online *[laughter]*.

Emily Sloane: ...USAID funded, so *[laughs]*.

Luke Bostian: ...like how do I get that? ...imagine we did, and we wanted to do a desk review, and we do a desk review.

Emily Sloane: Yeah. Probably just ask for it. I don't know. I mean if anybody else has better –

Emily Farr: I mean we're compiling the – generally all EMMA PCMMA reports should be compiled in two places – the EMMA website, and the D group. However, usually the data is not included in there, but it should at least give you contact people. We don't yet have a system for compiling all of the data, but I mean that would be a great long term goal. I would also just say like the data that tends to be available right now tends to be more macro level. So like national level, major markets. So we don't always get the sort of nuances of what's happening at small village level, which can be quite different, and can have implications for the kind of response that you can do.

We are also, as Dina mentioned, we're trying to focus more on trends. So I think that means you don't always have to get – you don't have to repeat the sort of extensive data collection that you do during one of these intensive market assessments. But technically in PCMMA you should be developing a monitoring framework where you look at a few key indicators every three months, every six months, or whatever. And you should also go back in the post crisis setting to test your predictions, and to see if they were right.

But it should be a fairly light monitoring requirement, yeah.

Usman Iqtidar: I think I'll take a couple questions from the webinar now. So, Ashleigh?

Ashleigh: Sure. We have about – let's see, we have about 50 people online right now. And some good questions coming in. Everybody was really silent during the presentations, listening intently. And now the questions are flowing. So, one clarification question that we had from Ron Ajeet, about the questions that are asked during pre-crisis mapping, and then emergency mapping. Are they mostly the same? Do they differ? Just in general.

And then I'm going to add one more question onto that with some participants asking about the applicability of the tool to some specific experiences. And so one experience was about rapid and more frequent crisis contexts, i.e. multiple flooding incidences in the same region. And then somebody asked specifically about the tool in the context of wild capture fish or other marine products. And I'll stop now *[laughter]*.

Emily Farr: Okay, so the first question – sorry, just really quickly repeat the first question.

Ashleigh: The first question was just a clarification question asking about the questions –

Emily Farr: Yeah, okay.

Ashleigh: ...pre-crisis tool, and emergency –

Emily Farr: So I would – I mean based on my experience, the questions are very much the same kinds of things. The only thing is you would be asking about the past. So you might say, "In 2010, what happened to prices? In 2010, what happened to volumes?" But other than that, the questions are by and large the same.

Dina Brick: Yeah, one thing that is different from ours is that we're asking about trends. So we're not saying, "What's the volume last week?" Or, "How

much did you – what is the quantity that you traded during this past week?" But we're saying, "Before the last drought, versus right after the last drought, what were those differences? So if you can describe percent changes." And that's something we're talking about, right? Like can we do proportional piling for people that are not as literate or numerate, versus – it's sort of PRA, basic PRA tools, but it is a slight difference in the Darfur case.

Oh, and then the second one.

Emily Farr: So, context of multiple floods? Yeah, I mean I think you could consider it in a couple of ways, off the top of my head. I mean you could just take one of those floods that is maybe typical of flood hazards. Or you could try to look at it over kind of a longer time period, if those floods are occurring really close together. I mean you could kind of expand your period of analysis. That's what I'd say off the top of my head.

Emily Sloane: ...fish [laughter].

Emily Farr: Yeah, I mean I think in the Philippines actually they did look at fish markets. Because they were very much affected. But again, often, like it's just about defining your market properly. I think in the end they decided they were going to focus on fishing nets, because that was the item that was most important for recovery, rather than looking at what was happening to the fish themselves. Although you would end up capturing that during your assessments.

Usman Iqtidar: Great. Thank you. Now will be in the room. So.

Chris Kagee: Hi, good morning, I'm Chris Kagee. My question is the focus is on some of these slower onset crises. As the crises mature, the markets generally degrade further and further and further. Some of those degradations are dependent on prior degradations. Others are independent. From what I have heard you discuss this morning, you're taking two points in time – pre-crisis and post crisis. Are you doing any analyses at multiple points in a long, slow onset crisis to take into account the evolution of the degradation, and decoupling the dependent and independent variables there?

Dina Brick: Take a crack. Because the crisis that we've decided upon, the one that we're sure about in Darfur is drought. And that's one of those, arguably, right? And they were looking at it. I think actually what you just said is probably a recommendation for me as I go back. What we had planned was looking at –

Chris Kagee: Cite them [laughter].

Dina Brick:

Yeah, I will *[laughter]*. Noted. Yeah. What we had talked about was trying to look at – this is over the course of a year. So this wasn't a multiple year drought. This was sort of a missed rainy season. And so what they were – what we were talking about is when during that period are we going to be collecting data? When what is our reference year? What is our reference moment? What we talked about is right before the rain started again is really when the crisis was the most pronounced.

You're right, though. That's a compounded effect, right? It's not just that May was terrible compared to April. That's not true. May was compared to – was terrible compared to last May, right? So the way we ask the questions – right now the way it's planned is the way we ask the questions will be like, "What was the effect of the drought? What was the effect compared with the season before, in a qualitative way?" And I'm hoping that will capture some of that qualitatively.

But I don't think we're going to really be able to decouple. There's sort of too many variables in that to be able to quantitatively decouple – like identify the causality of some of that. But I'm writing this down for *[laughs]* when we do that. I think it's sort of a learning in progress. You might have some. You guys were doing similar –

Emily Farr:

Yeah. Well, I think part of your question is also what we've been discussing with some of those challenges around that period of analysis, some of the seasonal evolution that would happen even during a slow onset crisis, a drought. I mean in Ethiopia, we chose to look at a drought that was kind of bad but not like the worst in terms of the year that we looked at. And so I mean it was more just as we were talking to people, just kind of to give an example, people were able to say, "Well, even over the course of this evolution, for example this commodity, this commodity, like these were still available in the market."

But then they'd say things like, "Well, but if you'd asked me about like a really, really bad drought, like happened back in this period of time, then things were no longer available, and so we had to do this instead." So it depends a little bit on how – the hazard, the specific hazard, because we're not just asking people generally about a drought. We're asking people about a very specific drought that happened.

So part of our own analysis in figuring out what reference period we wanted to use was like, "Well, are we more interested in something where it maybe gets really, really bad over time, or do we want something that maybe happens more frequently but isn't quite as bad?" So I think you can do some element of controlling for that.

And then of course that's all in the pre-crisis context. But if there is actually a drought, then you also want to be monitoring and looking at what happens in a market over the evolution of that actual event, right? So that would be a different approach, more of the actual kind of emergency aspect of it.

Usman Iqtidar: One more from the room, and then we'll go back to the webinar people, or one final question. So I guess –

Vanessa: Thank you so much for the presentation. My name is Vanessa, and I'm with a private –

AV Tech: Yeah, will you please make sure your mic is on?

Vanessa: Yeah. So my question is mostly regarding the recommendations that you come up with after you do all the analysis, after you do all the – just very extensive. You had mentioned that you don't know if it's actually going to be useful for anyone, or if anyone is going to implement it, especially funding. A lot of factors come into play that now it's beyond you. But within your recommendations, are there any sustainable kind of advice that you can give to the people that affect all of this? Like the workers, the actual market, maybe doing a collaborative fund, and having a huge storage that is water tight, or what suggestions could you give that would make it sustainable and not dependent completely on public funding, which could be very volatile?

Emily Sloane: Good question. I don't think we have a complete answer to that. I mean I would say a lot of the recommendations that we made in Pakistan were not really directed towards IRC. They were directed towards government at different levels. They were directed towards more development agencies. Possibly private sector. There were water filtration plants that were springing up privately around Pakistan, and we – one recommendation was that those were – well, a recommendation. They were a good thing [*laughs*]. And that they should be promoted, and they should – government, whether through government policy or through just private sector expansion.

So I think I mean there's room to make recommendations, but we need to make sure that those recommendations are reaching those audiences. So I think there's, as I mentioned, there's a lot more work to be done in terms of reaching out to sort of non-traditional audiences when we give our presentations. And we haven't totally done that yet. The people who listened to our results in Pakistan were mostly other humanitarians. So that's something we need to work on.

Female: More of a macro?

Emily Sloane: I think there's both. I think there's both. I think it just depends on the context.

Emily Farr: I mean if you're thinking about sustainability in more of this resilience aspect, I mean a lot of the recommendations do get at kind of longer term issues, if that makes sense. I mean they're not relevant to just a limited point in time. I mean just thinking about some of the recommendations that we made. It's around like building capacity of the local meat processing factory. And that's because then in times of drought people will actually be able to sell their – the local factory would be able to purchase an adequate quantity of a local animal. If you look at something like that, I mean you kind of work with the meat processing factory, and that's a – hopefully has a sustainable impact over time.

Or, looking at enhancing some of the swollen water conservation structures. Or there was one to introduce a new variety of maize into the region that would get a better price, but the seeds just simply aren't locally available. So those are things that I would see as kind of more the idea is to get it more at the long term sustainable solution.

Dina Brick: Final comment. If you are dependent [*laughs*] on public funding, also, I mean I think these are great in terms of like recommendations that can be made that are not dependent on it. But an interesting thing in the Darfur project is that it's a three year program, and this was something that's built in. So it's not like a six month emergency project. It's actually built into a resilience program. And that's something I think we are doing more of at CRS, and I think other NGOs are now – I think we should be looking to do more of this kind of a thing built into our longer term programs as well.

Usman Iqtidar: We're going to take a last question, one short, last question from the webinar people.

Ashleigh: I don't know how short this will be [*laughter*], but this is a question from Gina. And her question was, "How are you integrating gender into the analysis, given that women are often more affected by disasters, that their roles and responsibilities increase post crisis, and that they are primarily responsible for food security and water collection for their families, in addition to facing risks of gender based violence post crisis?"

Emily Sloane: This is one of our specific learning objectives for this OFDA grant that we have, is to look at how we can better address gender. We haven't figured it out yet [*laughs*], but we've been doing some thinking on it. So I mean I think one of the criticisms of EMMA and other market assessment tools is that they have not adequately integrated these issues that are very important, very relevant. They give them some lip service. They say,

"Oh, it's important to consider gender," blah-blah-blah, and that is peppered throughout the document, but as far as I have seen, it hasn't really been applied in any very meaningful way in many assessments.

We tried to do it sort of last minute in Pakistan, and it did not work at all. We had a team of 18 men [*laughs*] who – I was walking around being like, "Don't forget gender in your questionnaires." Didn't quite work. So in Niger we're trying to be a little more thoughtful about it. And I think what we've discovered so far is I mean it needs to come from an understanding of the context. The risk is if you do it sort of last minute, you're going to find out information that you already know, such as women are responsible for food security, or women do a lot of the water collection, or things that are always very obvious.

So you need to sort of challenge your team a little bit. But you have to direct them as well. So it has to be based on a knowledge of what gender dynamics are already at play, and then take it a step further. I think it can also – you can also address it by your choice of critical market systems. So, for example, in Niger, we're looking at livestock. We know that women are much more involved with small scale livestock, like the shoats. So we're probably going to focus on that rather than on cattle, and see if we can come up with some interesting recommendations to sort of put them in a slightly more powerful position.

And you also have these what they call key analytical questions that sort of guide your research throughout the market assessment. So if you have a particular question that is specifically about gender, and for example what is the impact of floods on men and versus women in this particular critical market system, then you're basically forcing your team to put those questions in a systematic way in the questionnaire, and to actually address it in their analysis. So those are some thoughts. But I think there's a lot more to do.

Usman Iqtidar:

Well, thank you so much. Before I let Laura make the concluding remarks, I'd quickly like to point out some housekeeping things. Thank you so much, Emily Sloane, Emily Farr, and Dina, for the presentations and your thoughts today. Thank you so much for attending. For all those who have subscribed for this event, please look out for our email in the next two weeks. We'll be giving you guys post-event resources which will include this wonderful presentation, along with some other material. So look out for that.

And the people who are attending the event, please try to fill out the survey that were on your seats and pass them down to Angie, who is sitting outside. And another thing, yeah. Microlinks' very own, Kristen O'Planick is in Uganda right now, and she asked me to tell you about this

event tomorrow, which is a SEEP webinar, in partnership with LEO project and BEAM exchange on using Systemic M&E tools in the Feed the Future Uganda.

This will cover the context and objectives of the program, the theory of change used, the strategic approach applied, features of the tool, and how they combine tools to monitor structural changes in the access of Ugandan farmers to appropriate and affordable inputs. Yeah. That's a little complicated, but I'm sure you *[laughs]* will be interested. So register for it on the SEEP website. And also Microlinks will be taking a hiatus for about two months, and then we will be back in September. So look out for our other events.

And then, with that, I thank you so much, again, and I would like Laura for her concluding remarks.

Laura Meissner:

Thank you so much, Usman. I'd just like to thank Emily, Emily, and Dina once more. And thank all of you who have joined us in person or online. I think it's been terrific to hear the different lessons, especially from the different contexts, and as well your questions, which I think really helped to sort of challenge us and get further in our thinking. Some of the common themes that I saw coming up again and again is that this is a terrific way for us to build capacity.

You heard it said that among the humanitarian community building capacity to understand and analyze markets is still a really big challenge for us. And doing it immediately post-disaster is nigh impossible. So I think this is a terrific chance for us. The importance of sharing our data, doing desk review, especially I think given with a tool like PCMMA where the point isn't so much the data, you know. EMMA has an entire page where we talk about appropriate imprecision, and how it doesn't matter exactly what the numbers are, it matters what the trends are.

And so how do we make sure that the data gets out there? Not just for all you USAID funded folks, who have to do it, but to make sure that it has the context so that you're able to understand it and then use it yourselves. I think also the issue around reference points and baselines, for those slow onset crises – do we have multiple reference points, how are we going to manage that? Do we look at the worst of a crisis? What does that mean if we're also trying to have an early warning system and monitor? We don't want to set our trigger with when things are the absolute worst. That's not going to help us out either.

And then finally probably most importantly is that when we conclude our assessment, that that's really when our work starts in terms of making sure that this information gets into the right hands, whether this be post country

governments and development actors, this is the local private sector and getting them to invest in preparedness, maybe the other side of our own organizations, whatever that may be, making sure that these are really taken into consideration so that we can try and lessen the impact of that next crisis.

I would like to close it out and again just thank you to everyone, to the Microlinks team, the audience, and of course our presenters. Thanks.

[End of Audio]